The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.30

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1890.

VOL. XXX.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160 FLEET STREET E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXX.

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

Fatherhood Denoted by the Trinity—By Rev. W. Kerr-Smith, M.A. 1
The Divine Guest—By Rev. Joseph Maskell ... 4
The Christian in the World—By Rev. H. M. Maynard 6
Can God be Known by Human Wisdom—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D. ... 13
The Divine Paternity—By Rev. W. J. Hocking ... 16
The Spiritual Element in Preaching—By Rev. A. J. F. Behrends, D.D. 25
The Dignity of Labour — By Ven. Archdeacon Cheetham, D.D. 37
Faith Necessary and Supernatural—By Rev. Charles Gore, M.A. 39
Conformity to the World—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 49
Worship of the Sacred Heart—By Rev. R. R. Kane, LL.D. 52
A Silent God — By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 61
Irish Protestantism—By Rev. John W. Kaye, M.A. 64
Of Faith and Love in Christ Jesus—By Rev. Canon Dwyer, A.M. 73
Love of God—By Rev. L. R. Rawnsley, M.A. ... 75
Subduing the Body—By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 85
Moses' Invitation to Hobab—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 97
His People and His Sorrow—By Rev. Henry Brass, M.A., F.G.S. 109
The Labour of Love—By Ven. S. Cheetham, D.D. 121
Talitha Cumi—By Rev. Samuel Barber 123
John Henry Newman—By Rev. W. F. Cobb ... 133
The Relief of Derry—By Rev. R. W. Colquhoun, B.A. (Camb.) 136
The Late Canon Liddon—By Rev. Canon Scott-Holland 145
The Father of Lights—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, A.M. 148
The President's Address (Hull Church Congress)—Bishop of Durham 157
The Limits of Christ's Knowledge—By Bishop of Meath 159
Corban—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne... 169
The Girls' Friendly Society—By Bishop Pakenham Walsh 172
Oppositions of Science—By Rev. John Brooks Penfold... 181
Revolution—By Rev. M. B. Hogg, B.A. 183
Ideals—By Rev. L. R. Rawnsley, M.A. 193
Reverence—By Rev. John A. Jennings, M.A. ... 196
The Development of Christian Doctrine—By the Bishop of Manchester 205
The Promise of Life in Christ Jesus—By Rev. George Jannings, M.A. 217

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

The Church : Its Character, Privileges, and Obligations—By Rev. William Cowan, M.A. ... 220
The Late Canon Liddon—By Rev. Dr. Bright ... 229
Spoiled Salt—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne 230
The Judgment of Jesus—By Rev. Sinclair Carolin, M.A. 241
The Apostolic Church—By. Rev. G. R. Ekins, C.M.S. 243
The Purpose, Probational and Saving, of Affliction —By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, LL.D. ... 253
The Church an Ambassador in Bonds—By Rev. J. Robertson, M.A. 265
Of Jesus Christ Eating and Drinking—By Rev. Canon Dwyer, A.M. 277
Christ the Manifestation of God—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D. 279
The Right Use of Sunday—By Rev. W. H. Bliss, M.A., Mus. Bac.... 289
The One Foundation—By Rev. H. S. Verschoyle, M.A. 293
St. Matthew- By Rev. Sinclair Carolin, M.A. ... 301
The Triumph of Patience—By Rev. J. Seller ... 303

SERMONS BY :—

Bishop of Durham—The President's Address (Hull Church Congress)... 157
Bishop of Manchester—The Development of Christian Doctrine 205
Bishop of Meath—The Limits of Christ's Knowledge 159
Bishop Pakenham Walsh — The Girls' Friendly Society 172
Barber, Rev. Samuel—*Talitha Cumi* 123
Behrends, Rev. A. J. F., D.D.—The Spiritual Element in Preaching 25
Bliss, Rev. W. H., M.A., Mus. Bac.—The Right Use of Sunday 289
Brass, Rev. Henry, M.A., F.G.S.—His People and His Sorrow 109
Bright, Rev. Dr.—The Late Canon Liddon ... 229
Carolin, Rev. Sinclair, M.A.—The Judgment of Jesus 241
Carolin, Rev. Sinclair, M.A.—"St. Matthew" ... 301
Cheetham, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D.—The Dignity of Labour 37
Cheetham, Ven. S., D.D.—The Labour of Love ... 121
Cobb, Rew. W. F.—John Henry Newman... ... 133
Colquhoun, Rev. R. W., B.A. (Camb.)—The Relies of Derry 136
Cowan, Rev. William, M.A. — The Church : Its Character, Privileges, and Obligations 220
Dwyer, Rev. Canon, A.M.—Of Faith and Love in Christ Jesus 73

283.05
C713
V. 30

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Dwyer, Rev. Canon, A.M.—Of Jesus Christ Eating and Drinking 277
Ekins, Rev. G. R., C.M.S.—The Apostolic Church 243
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D., F.R.S.—A Silent God 61
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D., F.R.S.—Subduing the Body 85
Gore, Rev. Charles, M.A.—Faith Necessary and Supernatural 39
Hocking, Rev. W. J.—The Divine Paternity ... 16
Hogg, Rev. M. B., B.A.—Revolution 183
Jannings, Rev. George, M.A.—The Promise of Life in Christ Jesus 217
Jennings, Rev. John A., M.A.—Reverence... ... 196
Kane, Rev. R. R., LL.D.—Worship of the Sacred Heart 52
Kaye, Rev. John W., M.A.—Irish Protestanism ... 64
Kaye, Rev. John W., A.M.—The Father of Lights 148
Kerr-Smith, Rev. W., M.A.—Fatherhood Denoted by the Trinity 1
Maskell, Rev. Joseph—The Divine Guest 4
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A.—Moses' Invitation to Hobab 97
Maynard, Rev. H. M.—The Christian in the World 6
Naylor, Rev. Thomas B., B.D.—Christ the Manifestation of God 279
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—Can God be Known by Human Wisdom 13
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—The Purpose, Probational and Saving, of Affliction 253
Penfold, Rev. John Brooks—Oppositions of Science 181
Rawnsley, Rev. L. R., M.A.—Love of God ... 75
Rawnsley, Rev. L. R., M.A.—Ideals 193
Rawstorne, Rev. W. E.—Conformity to the World 49
Rawstorne, Rev. W. E.—Corban 169
Rawstorne, Rev. W. E.—Spoiled Salt 230
Robertson, Rev. J., M.A.—The Church an Ambassador in Bonds 265
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon—The Late Canon Liddon 145
Seller, Rev. J.—The Triumph of Patience 303
Verschoyle, Rev. H. S., M.A.—The One Foundation... 293

TEXTS TO SERMONS :—

Numbers x. 29 97
Joshua xxiv. 27... 136
1 Samuel xxviii. 6 61
1 Kings xi. 26 183
2 Kings v. 2, 3. 172
Job xxii. 21 1
Job xxiii. 16 253
Psalm lxxiii. 16, 17, 28, ... 229
Psalm cxii. 220
S. Matthew xi. 16-19 277
S. Matthew xvi. 17 39
S. Matthew xxii. 21 241
S. Mark v. 41 123
S. Mark vii. 10-13 169
S. Mark xii. 30... 75
S. Luke v. 27, 28 301
S. Luke vii. 47, 48, 50 73
S. Luke xi. 2 16
S. Luke xii. 16-21 193
S. Luke xiv. 27... 85
S. Luke xiv. 34-35 230
S. Luke xix. 41... 109
S. Luke xxi 19... 303
S. John i. 47 133
S. John xiv. 8 279
S. John xviii. 15 6
Acts ii. 42 243
Acts xxiv. 14 64
Romans xii. 2 49
1 Corinthians i. 22 13

TEXTS TO SERMONS :— PAGE

1 Corinthians xiii. 9 203
Ephesians iii. 13-19 145
Ephesians iii. 19 52
Ephesians vi. 20 265
Philippians iv. 5 101
1 Thessalonians i. 3 121
2 Thessalonians iii. 10... 37
1 Timothy vi. 20 181
2 Timothy i. 1 217
Hebrews ii. 10 159
Hebrews v. 8 159
Hebrews xii. 28 196
S. James i. 17 148
1 S. John ii. 15 49
Revelations i. 10 289
Revelations iii. 20 4

LEADING ARTICLES :—

A Year with the German Reeds.—I... 9
A Year with the German Reeds.—II. 19
Foreign Missions 31
Striving Together 43
London over the Border 56
The Clergy Pension Fund 67
Church Schools... 78
The Continent and Peace 78
The Church and Labour Questions 90
Insurance of Children 101
Africa.—The Bullet and the Bible 113
What Authority Have our Lord's Words 125
The Eight Hours' Question 141
The Labour Movement 150
Law and League in Ireland 165
Curates 175
The Behring's Sea Dispute 185
"General" Booth's Propaganda.—I. 198
"General" Booth's Propaganda.—II. 211
The New Puritanism 222
Archdeacon Farrar's Sermon 233
Episcopal Registry Office 248
The Eastward Position 256
The Bishop of Lincoln's Case... 257
The Church and "Assisted" Education 270
What is the Benefit of Private Absolution 282
Fanatical Criticism 295
Christmas Carols 305

PAPERS :—

Religious Revivals in the XIII. and XIV. Centuries—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. 79
John Henry Newman 90
Confirmation as a Means of Grace—By Rev. John R. Vernon, M.A.... 91
Here and Now? Or Hereafter?—By Rev. Ralph W. Harden, B.A. 101
Brotherhoods—By Rev. John R. Vernon, M.A. ... 113
Trade Unionism 114
Death of Canon Liddon 126
Philippians ii. 5-12—By Rev. Prebendary Bassett, M.A. 175, 186
An Unscientific View of the Creation and the Fall of Satan and of Man 199
Lecture on the Puritan Period—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. 248
The Personality of Satan—By Rev. T. B. Naylor, B.D. 296, 306

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion Explained and Established"—By Maurice Day, D.D., Bishop of Cashel and Waterford 10
"*The Expositor*" ... 21, 69, 128, 178, 223, 284
"*The Messenger*" 21, 234, 309
"Historic Doubts" 21
"Lux Mundi"—Edited by Charles Gore 32
"The Wider Hope" 34

988264

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :— PAGE

"Presbyterianism in Dublin and the South and West of Ireland"—By Charles H. Irwin ... 57
"The Christian Irishman" 70
"The Choirmaster's Companion to Hymns Ancient and Modern"—By Mr. I. H. Jeayes 82
"Robert Brett (of Stoke Newington), His Life and Work"—By T. W. Belcher, D.D., M.D. ... 82
"Cassiope and other Poems"—By Boleyne Reeves 106
"An Appeal to Unitarians"—By a Convert from Unitarianism 106
"St. Patrick's Bells" 116
"Jesus and the Resurrection"—By Andrew Bible 142
"Lux Mundi," etc.—A Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Carr 212
"*The Treasury*" 234
"Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies on the Religion of the Incarnation" 257
"In Darkest England and the Way Out"—By General Booth 271
"Original Hymn Tunes"—By Rev. F. W. Davis... 284
"Sonnets and other Poems"—By Joseph John Murphy 284
"Nunnery Life in the Church of England"—By Sister Mary Agnes, O.S.B. 284
"The Fountain of Sorrow—the River of Joy;" "Rizpah and Early Poems;" "Stream of Talent" 297
"Awake" 309

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Evolution 10, 21, 45
Who Takes Scripture Literally 11, 23, 58
What is to be Adored 23, 35
"A Year with the German Reeds" ... 35, 44, 57, 70
The Toormore Case 35
A Protest 44
Dr. Behrend's Sermon... 45
Protestantism and Infidelity 45
Altar Lights—the Real Presence 46
Attempts to Clear the Atmosphere 47, 106, 167, 202, 214
Hearing in Churches 58
The So-Called Medical Language in the Third Gospel 58, 82, 92, 118, 130, 152, 166, 188, 223, 236, 260
My Critic, Mr. Edmund Lawrence 70
Christ and the Old Testament 71
"I Perceive that Virtue is Gone Out of Me."—Luke viii. 46 83
Canon Smith on the Old Testament and Our Lord's Authority 107
John Henry Newman 107
Newman on the Pope's Personal Infallibility ... 107
Lux Mundi 116
Confirmation Grace 117, 128, 142, 166, 178, 190, 203, 214, 225, 235, 251, 261, 274, 299, 309
Our Lord's Resurrectton Body 119
The Maltese Marriage Question 119
Cardinal Newman: An Unsolved Problem... ... 129
Dr. Newman in Tract No. 90 on Presence and its Effects 142
Brotherhoods 143
The Word was Made Flesh 153, 190
A Correction 153
The S. Bartholomew Massacre in 1572 179

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

Romanism 179
Canon Scott-Holland's Sermon 189
Canon Liddon 190
The Lux Mundi Controversy 191
The Black Rubric Again 191, 226
Corrections and Comments 212
The Bishop of Meath's Sermon ... 213, 227, 235
Curates 214
Atonement to Canon Liddon's Memory 227
Efforts against Darkness, Sorrow, and Suffering ... 259
All Souls Day 260
Political Economy and Morals 274, 285, 298, 309
St. Luke and the LXX. 274, 299
Historical Evidence of the Ascension 274
The Last Eleven Verses of St. Mark ... 285, 309
The Irrationality of Ritualism 286
General Booth's Propaganda 298
Private Absolution 298
Churchyard Rights and Wrongs 311
The Recent "Peace Sunday" 311

POETRY :—

Time (J. W. Kaye) 215
The Lamp and the Olive-Trees (Joseph J. Murphy) 275
Christmas Carol, 1890 (Charles R. Panter) ... 311

MISCELLANEOUS :—

The Lives of the Bishops of Lincoln... 10
Miss E. A. Boden as Lady Missioner 24
Lay and Clerical Representatives from North Europe 24
Archdeacon Haigh 30
Presentation to the Bishop of St. Albans 30
Llandaff Diocesan Lay Helper's Association ... 43
Persecution of the late Rev. Thomas Helmore ... 43
East London Church Fund 43
Overcrowded Cemeteries 44
Mr. Gladstone on Education of Women 47
Sale of Glebes 48
Rural Deans for Archdeaconry of London 55
The Warburton Lecturer 56
Burial Reform and the Prince of Wales 59
The Steel Theological Studentships 60
Speech Day at Oakham School 67
Apposition at St. Paul's School 67
Canon Maclure, Dean of Manchester 71
Bishop of Dover 71
Male and Female Volunteer Missionaries 72
Exclusiveness of the Docker's Union... 95
London Diocesan Church Reading Union 100
Sir Albert Rollit, M.P., and Funeral Reform ... 227
Dr. Momerie's Testimonial 259
Prizes of Christmas Carols 263
Professor Sayce 263
Missionary Societies at Oxford 275
Rev. Dr. Dyson 295
Enthroning the the Bishop of Bangor 312

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

The Church of England Pulpit

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XXX.—No. 758. SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1890. PRICE ONE PENNY.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FATHERHOOD DENOTED BY THE TRINITY.

BY THE REV. W. KERR-SMITH, M.A., VICAR OF EMMANUEL CHURCH, LEEDS.

SERMON PREACHED IN EMMANUEL CHURCH ON TRINITY SUNDAY, JUNE 1ST, 1890.

"Acquaint thyself with God and be at peace, thereby hall good come to thee."—JOB xxii. 21.

I DARE say you have noticed—no doubt it has been often pointed out to you—that the arrangement of Sunday services in the Prayer Book is such, that each fact in the Christian Creed is properly presented for our consideration in its turn.

The Fatherhood of God is perhaps rather assumed throughout, than presented to us for separate acceptance. There is nothing that is essentially Christian in the statement, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." Every religion starts from that. It is fundamental and axiomatic. We don't argue about it. We accept it. We don't attempt to explain it. We are here in the midst of this busy world. Matter, force, intelligence are all about us. We are part and parcel of it all. As an intelligent bit of creation we are of course interested in the plan, the purpose, and the destiny of that in which our being is involved.

In working out, or seeking to work out that destiny our intelligence demands a starting-point. There is, we say, a meaning in existence. It is a serious business this life of ours. It does not satisfy us that we should merely amuse ourselves for awhile with our environment, that we should be like kittens, who are content to run round and round and play with their own tails. There is purpose in all this beauty, and order, and relationship, and mutual dependence, and power, and capacity. But when we try and draw this definite *line of purpose*, our mind demands that there should be a point from which to start. We ask, as Napoleon asked his generals, "Who made all these?" And we are appalled with the idea of Omnipotence, which the question suggests. "When was it done?" And we are perplexed with the idea of Eternity. "Whence did it arise?" And we are confronted with the idea of Space. We are puzzled. Our limit is indefinable. Yet we must have a starting-point.

Those of you who have had to study Euclid will remember that the book begins by assuming the fact of a point. But the definition (if so it may be called) is arbitrary and negative. It does not say what a point is. It says what it is not. "A point," it says, "is that which has neither parts nor magnitude," and then it goes on: "Let it be granted that a line may be drawn from any one point to another point in a straight line."

Is it not something like that with the line of purpose of which I spoke just now? We must have a point from which to begin to draw it.

Religion fixes that point, and calls it God—God! a being whose parts we cannot explain, whose magnitude we cannot define. "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of Heaven and Earth."

The Christian Creed then goes on to show how this mysterious Source of All has provided for the revelation of Himself and His will to our finite understanding. He sent one whom He calls (so it is revealed) His Son. Not that that explains exactly the relationship between the Second and the First Person in the Trinity, but it is an idea which we can grasp because it corresponds to something which is matter of human experience. He takes our flesh because that is substance which we can observe. He lives our life because that exhibits conduct and character which we can estimate and understand. He passes through every phase of human experience—toil of body, sorrow of heart, labour of mind, agony of spirit—that in all points He may be brought into perfect sympathy with men. Every faculty is exercised. Every sentiment is allowed full scope for its display.

His source is Divine, "conceived by the Holy Ghost." His entrance into the world is natural, "Born of the Virgin Mary." His earthly life is the common lot of men, "He suffered under Pontius Pilate." Death puts a period to His earthly existence, "He is crucified, dead, and buried."

Then what follows? This Divine man, who has held and followed closely the clue—the golden thread of destiny—from its *source*, is able (as other men are not) to follow it to its *conclusion*. He solves for us the mystery of existence. He lifts the heretofore impenetrable veil of death. "The third day He rose again from the dead." He indicates

the goal, "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty."

There is nothing that is extravagant or contrary to reason in all this. The line of the Divine purpose has been drawn from point to point. "Let it be granted that a line may be drawn from any one point to another in a straight line." He came from the source whose parts we cannot explain, whose magnitude we cannot define. He has passed along to the end, which is as incomprehensible and ungraspable as the source. But His human experience has qualified Him for a work which it is a comfort to us to know that He will fulfil. Having perfectly fulfilled His own destiny, He will assist in determining ours: "From thence He shall come at the end of the world to judge both the quick and the dead."

But that is not all, The tangled web of life having been thus unravelled, and its mystery unveiled, it is provided that communication shall be henceforth and for ever kept up between man and God. There shall be a perpetual outgoing of Divine Power from God, a perpetual influx of Divine Grace into this world of ours: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." An outward and visible means shall be established, and perpetual provision made for its continuance. "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." And its effect shall be the satisfactory solution of life's common problems; the relationship of man to man is permanently fixed by the law of love: "I believe in the communion of saints." Peace and rest is assured: "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." The present life is linked on to the future: "I believe in the resurrection of the body." And the goal is authoritatively declared: "I believe in the life everlasting."

That, then, is the Christian Creed. Its value depends on its relation to certain well assured and valid historical facts. The Church has wisely ordered that these facts shall ever be kept before our minds. Each important incident is commemorated in turn. The fact of God is assumed, as we have said, all through the series. But we have our days for celebrating the incarnation of the Son of God (Christmas); the manifestation of His Divinely appointed work (the Epiphany); His conflict with sin (Lent); His death (Good Friday); His Resurrection (Easter Day); His Ascension (Ascension Day); and the coming of the Holy Ghost with all its blessed consequences (Whit Sunday). Last Sunday the historical series closed, and to-day we sum up the results, as it were, by our acceptance of the mystery which it involves —the mystery of the Holy Trinity—of God the Father, who made me and all the world—of God the Son, who redeemed me and all mankind—of God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifies me and all the elect people of God.

To attempt to define or to explain the nature of the Trinity would be to attempt the impossible. You must begin by comprehending that of which the parts are to us undiscoverable, and by measuring that of which the magnitude is undefinable. We come back to our axiom. "Let it be granted that a line may be drawn from any one point to any other point in a straight line." Let it be granted that God in Christ Jesus has drawn that line—the line by following which to either point will bring us face to face with the Eternal—the line the drawing of which has necessitated the revelation of the mystery which we commemorate on this Trinity Sunday.

Well, all this is doctrine. And like all doctrine it is hard and informing; but not very directly a part of our every-day thought. But it is necessary to think of these things because they are in the nature of foundation truths. And on Trinity Sunday we can scarcely avoid it. It is not very interesting to watch the laying of the foundations of a house that is building. But we know perfectly well that the stability, the durability, the wear and tear, and the beauty and interest of the building depend on the foundation being rightly laid. Just so it is with this life of ours. If our thoughts, our actions, our daily conduct is to be right, and beautiful, useful and durable; if it is not only to stand the wear and tear of time, but to be serviceable and acceptable to all eternity, it must be "rooted and grounded in the faith." I shall not, therefore, apologise for having been somewhat "dry" in what I have said thus far—if it has been "dry." We are rather apt, I think, in these days of novel-made theology, magazine philosophy, and *Tit-Bits* literature, to be a little namby-pamby in our religion. Everything must be made spicy and interesting. The political speeches which we read must be well interlarded with items for laughter; we prefer "Chit chat" columns and "By the ways" in our daily papers to the more solid leading article which suited the generation that is past. And our very sermons must be light, and not too earnest. They must not make too great a demand on our attention, or call for too serious an effort of thought. We want not stimulus, power, and solid information, but interest, amusement, and light refreshment. Well, the preacher may, and sometimes does, try and accommodate the supply to the demand. But, my friends, the goods in God's market are not altered to suit the fancies of a whimsical public taste. His grace and blessing are only to be obtained by diligent and sometimes painful effort. There is no short cut to heaven. Our express trains, and telephones, and hydraulic lifts will not help us much in this matter. The saints of old, so the hymn tells us

> "Climbed the steep ascent of heaven
> Midst peril, toil, and pain.'

And if we aspire to achieve the same results we must have grace given us "to follow in their train"—to conquer this mental sloth, this spiritual indolence,—and apply ourselves heartily to the task

of apprehending the "things which pertain to the kingdom of God."

You may believe me or not, as you please. But of this one thing I am very sure, that "whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith—and the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity." The love of the Father must be felt. The work of the Son must be accepted. The power of the Holy Ghost must be appropriated.

Three very practical thoughts occur to my mind in connection with this doctrine which we have been considering to-day.

1. First, the thought of God's continued interest in the world which He has made.

2. Secondly, the thought of the deep and real sympathy that the Son of God must have for all of the suffering sons of men.

3. Thirdly, the thought that the Holy Spirit is the best helper that men could possibly have.

(1.) First, then, the thought that God continues ever to take an interest in the world which He made.

It needs the doctrine of the Trinity to assure us of this. No doubt it is true that the book of Nature is full of testimony to the same effect. But the orderly working of natural law is familiar. The rising and setting of the sun, the return of the seasons, the bountiful provision for the stability of matter and the sustenance of life, and so forth, we are accustomed to take as matters of course. But the revelation of the Divine Purpose by means of the Incarnation, and the miraculous interference of the Holy Spirit are supernatural. You cannot receive these facts into your minds without being at the same time powerfully impressed with the thoughts of God's persevering concern for your well-being. He will not abandon men to their wilfulness, their ignorance, their sin. His love is everlasting. His interest never slackens. He will not despair of taming these stubborn and wayward wills of ours, and bringing us back to a state of loving subjection to Himself. Every revelation of the past, prepared for and pointed to Jesus and the Holy Spirit. Every privilege which we enjoy as members of His Church takes us back in thought to Galilee, and Judea, and the day of Pentecost. The doctrine of the Trinity is full of suggestive thoughts; and the first of these is this, that God is *very seriously in earnest* in wishing and working for man's salvation. He seems to be always saying the same thing, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." Now, my friends, you have dark and lonely moments sometimes. Yes, I know there are none here this morning who are not at times visited with an overwhelming sense of the hardship of their lot. Circumstances are adverse, everything is against them, the world seems to be in league to disappoint and distress them, love is unrequited, hopes are blighted, ideals shattered, and the soul appears to be stranded on a hard rock of depression, in the midst of a pitiless sea of adversity. Take heart of grace, my brother or my sister, God has not forgotten you. There is no fear of that. He who gave His own Son that you might be saved—He who gives His Holy Spirit that you may be sanctified, has already given you His best. There is light somewhere in this darkness. There is a haven not far off where you may be sheltered from the storm. Love, and Hope, and Truth are not far off if you would but lift the eye of faith and look for them. You are neither alone, nor forgotten, nor uncared for.

(2.) But, secondly there is the thought of the deep and real sympathy that the Son of God must have for all of the suffering sons of men.

The Son of God is also Son of man. "We have not an high priest that cannot be touched with a feeling for our infirmities: but was in all points tempted like as we are."

The doctrine not only speaks of love, it implies sympathy—not only an interest in and an affection for, but a feeling with us.

I do not know whether the love of God and the wisdom of God could have devised *another* way of salvation, but it seems to me that it would be impossible to have revealed a *kinder*. It makes my cross less burdensome to know that He carried one like it. It makes my way easier to know that He trod it before me. It makes my suffering lighter to know that He endured pain, and poverty, and toil, and torture before me. The valley of the shadow seems to be less dark when I recollect that it was once illumined with the light of His blessed presence. He knows what I want because He has felt my need. I can pour out my soul to Him because He has explored all the depths of human anguish; He has measured the extent and felt all the force of buman temptation.

(3.) And thirdly and lastly, there is the thought of the Holy Spirit as the best helper that men could possibly have.

And that for two reasons.

(1.) First, because He brings us in our innermost and truest self into direct contact with God. And being God He can reach every man at every moment.

He can interpret the life of Christ to all. He can make plain the love of the Father to all. He can unfold the truth to all. On the one side, He is ever with the Father and the Son in the sight of Heaven: on the other He is ever in the soul of man. He reaches up into heaven and takes the things of God—He reaches down to earth and shows them unto us.

(2.) And secondly, because He not only reveals truth and righteousness but He gives power to practise them. It is the will of God operating directly on the will of man. There is nothing improbable in this. We are told that these hypnotic experiments lately made in Leeds teach

us that some men have the power of passing on to others something which some call psychic force, others will-power; and that by so doing they can in a marvellous manner affect, and in some cases absolutely control the wills of those who submit themselves to their influence. I see nothing therefore improbable in the idea that the will of God acting through the spirit of God should control and direct the wills of those who voluntarily submit themselves to His gracious influence.

So then, my friends, in the doctrine of the Trinity we find the most reasonable solution of the problem of existence—a revelation of the source of our being— an unfolding of the plan and purpose of creation—an utter fulfilment of the destiny of our race—a clue by following which we can safely reach the goal of life—a link to connect the finite with the infinite—and wisdom and power to enable us to appropriate to the full the benefits and privileges which Revelation secures to us. May God give us faith to accept, and obedience to submit. Darkness still covers the earth and gross darkness the people; but in the light of this blessed doctrine we may see if we will the path of duty clearly defined in the present, and the way made sufficiently plain to the presence of the Eternal. We may "acquaint ourselves with God, and be at peace," and "thereby shall good come to us" both now and for ever.

THE DIVINE GUEST.

By the Rev. JOSEPH MASKELL, Master of Emanuel Hospital and Assistant Curate of St. James-the-Less, Westminster.

Sermon Preached at Emanuel Hospital, Westminster, on Whit Sunday, 1890.

"Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with Me."—Rev. iii. 20.

THE image is that of a guest arriving at sundown to ask for shelter and fellowship. A guest, however, who comes not merely for shelter and for His own sake; but as a friendly visitor to cheer, to benefit and be of use to the friend whom He seeks to visit. The words are solemn because they are spoken to us by our Master from Heaven. How He can come in to us, sup with us and we with Him, *i.e.*, impart unto us His own presence, receive us into intimate fellowship with Himself, is, of course, through the entrance of the Holy Spirit into our hearts and minds. It is by His Spirit that He knocks at the door of our hearts, and by His Spirit that He abides with us and inspires us with that which is good, enabling us "to think those things that be right," and to be guided into a "right judgment in all things."

The promise is large and free, the right of all who will claim it. None can have sunk lower than the Christian Church at Laodicea, to whom these words were first addressed, and who are described as "wretched and miserable, poor, blind and naked." And so, poor sinner and sufferer, whoever thou art, Christ by His Spirit knocks at the door of thy heart, waiting for admission there. We are reminded of the solemn truth that it is possible for us to have the Spirit *with* us but not *in* us. The Holy Ghost came down into the assembled Church on the Day of Pentecost, the first Whit Sunday, to abide therein to the end of time. We read of His advent then, we never read of His departure. He is with us and ready to bestow His grace upon us in all the ordinances of the Church; prayer, preaching, the sacraments and the ministry of the word of God. The Spirit is with us in the whispers of conscience; in the warnings given and the example set us by others; in the events and providences of our own lives. These all are sent to awaken us from our slumbers, and to encourage us to open the doors of our souls to the entrance of Him who is promised to be our Teacher, our Guide, our Advocate and Comforter. Suffering in one or other of its manifold forms; mercies and blessings received, the adverse circumstances and providences of our lives—these all are so many visitations from Him, and tell us that He is asking for admission. Listening in the attitude of reverence and faith, we "hear His voice," become more and more conscious of His presence who is not only our Judge but our Friend and Helper; our welcome and all-sufficient Guide. Well for us then if we open the door of our hearts to Him, that He may come in and make His continual abode with us. Great is our privilege and great our responsibility that we may have Him for our Guardian and Guide and our ever welcome guest, if only we will.

Amongst the sermons, in old French, of the Franciscan Friar, Oliver Maillard, which have come down to us from the fifteenth century, there is a remarkable one on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It is not only most instructive in itself, but it shows how much of spirituality and fervour was possible in the religion of the Middle Ages. Ignorant people are apt to think that there was no true religion abroad before the Reformation; that Christianity went to sleep with the death of the last Apostle, not to awake again till the advent of Luther. Those who read the writings of the Fathers and the friars know better. In spite of much that we might justly call "superstition," these writings are characterised by a wonderful knowledge of Scripture; by great earnestness and freedom of speech, and by an exalted tone of spirituality. People forget that our Lord promised to be with His Church to the end of the world, and that in no age was He ever absent from it, nor His Church wanting in true saints and servants of God. The Franciscan Maillard, in his quaint way, compares the soul of man to an hostel, or inn, with the Holy Spirit as a guest at the door, seeking

for admission therein. The sermon is very curious; but full of practical instruction. He exhorts his hearers thus:* "If thou, O devout soul, art able to receive and entertain thy king and sovereign, Jehovah, in the person of His Holy Spirit, what folly, what villainy and disgrace, if thou refusest shelter to such a guest. Can any greater honour be shown to thee than the opportunity to receive so worthy, so dear, so liberal a guest. If then thou desirest to receive, O devout soul, this illustrious guest, above all things take care that thy hostel, *i.e.*, thy conscience, shall be clean and swept of all that would be displeasing to Him. Take care that the gate-keeper shall be always ready at the door of thy conscience, for the Holy Spirit will pass by the door that is not open and ready to receive Him. If there be no one at the door to welcome Him, He will assuredly go away. If a prince came to the door of any hostel for even a temporary stay, what care would be taken that all should be worthy of one so illustrious and exalted. When, then, thy God and Sovereign Prince desires to take up His abode in thy conscience, what diligence oughtest thou to show in order to receive Him worthily."

He goes on quaintly to say, that we ought to have in the hostel or inn of the conscience, "three serving-maids—Prayer, Obedience, and Peace." The office of the first is to beseech and invite the divine guest to enter, for have we not the promise, "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall God give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?"

The office of Obedience is to open wide the door, that He may freely enter and find a hearty and sincere reception.

"The office of Peace is to receive Him joyfully, cheerfully, as the disciples did when they were gathered together on the first day of Pentecost, in accordance with their Lord's command. There was unity, peace and patience amongst them. They were altogether in one place, when suddenly there came cloven fiery tongues from heaven and sat upon each of them."

"Alas, too often," the preacher continues, "these three serving-maids do not work together, and the Spirit is driven away. Prayer calls on the divine guest and invites Him to enter; but Obedience turns a deaf ear; or she is so asleep that she misses the opportunity, and keeps the door shut and locked by the keys of various sins." In other words, many are ready to pray and to make many prayers, but are too full of their own self-willed disobedience to the will of God that they cannot receive Him. After that the Holy Ghost is called in by Prayer and the door opened by Obedience; the third servant, Peace, ought to receive, retain Him, and make Him a welcome guest. Peace is quietness of conscience. The Holy Spirit is sensitive, and can only rest in a quiet place; noise and disturbance drive Him away. He is gentle and serene, serious, circumspect, and cannot stay in a distracted household. He is the very spirit of peace.

"And indeed it seems," said the preacher, "a greater shame to disgrace, to drive Him away, than not to seek for Him, or never to know that He is near us." "If then, O devout soul, "thou desirest to know whether thou hast the abiding presence of this divine spirit, the soul's guest and friend, examine thyself whether thou hast this peace of conscience; for the sovereign secret of grace is to have true peace—peace of conscience, peace within. True peace, because there is a false peace which comes from insensibility to God; the peace of death; the conscience undisturbed, the soul indifferent."

He bids us, then, ask for the Holy Spirit through the serving-maid, Prayer; and by means of obedience, *i.e.*, willingness to fulfil His will, to open wide the door of the heart to his indwelling.

Then he goes on to say, "Let the third serving-maid, Peace, place upon the table of thy hostel the lamp of true faith, the bread of wisdom, the wine of compunction and contrition, the salt of prudence, the fruit of good works, the food of right thoughts, and the flowers of holy meditation. Then thou wilt give thy Guest good cheer; He will sup with thee and thou with Him. Thou shalt render Him much: but He will repay thee far more abundantly.

"Happy is he who thus receives into the hostel of the soul this welcome and honourable guest, one who is so rich, so bountiful and gracious; bringing blessing upon the dwelling wherein He abides; liberally rewarding His entertainer in this world and still more liberally in the world to come.

"To have Him for a guest is to have consolation in suffering; safe counsel in doubt and difficulty; peace in the midst of care; clearness of faith and certainty of Hope, which is the earnest of our inheritance in the kingdom of Heaven."

Our preacher concludes with the prayer: "O sweet and blessed Spirit, who art the sure Protector and Comforter of the desolate, the Father of the poor, the Light of the blind, the Friend of the penitent: before the eyes of Thy mercy, before the throne of Thy high majesty, I make my complaint, my prayer."

"Alas, most gentle Spirit, Thou knowest how the hostel of my conscience is besieged and sore beset by guests very different from Thee. Thou knowest what cruel assaults are made continually upon the fortress of my soul; what sore temptations from without and within oppress me. I need Thy help, and none but Thine. It is Thine and Thine alone to defend, protect and deliver me; Thine to strengthen and support me! Come then, tarry not. Chase away these busy foes. At Thy coming they will flee away and vanish as the smoke. As Thou descendedst visibly into the hostel of the Holy

* I give a paraphrase rather than a translation.

Apostles on the first Christian Pentecost, to comfort them, to strengthen them, to guide them aright, so now descend upon the poor hostel of my soul, and when Thou shalt be there, teach me true understanding and knowledge ; nourish me with the bread of life ; warm me with the fire of Thy love ; clothe me with the garment of righteousness and virtue. Inspire my soul with the seven gifts of grace, and defend it against the seven mortal sins ; be ever with me in this world by grace and in the other world by glory."

It is not I, then, who have preached to you to-day ; but a saint of the fifteenth century, and from a sermon which is not less than four hundred years old. We see how closely this old preacher follows the imagery of the text ; Jesus by His Spirit coming to seek entrance into the soul and condescending to the closest fellowship therein. Let not the lesson be lost upon us. Let not the promise of the Comforter be despised and refused by any of us.

Rather, may He find willing entrance in all our hearts ; may we live in the Spirit, walk in the Spirit, and suffer ourselves to be led by the Spirit. And may His grace deliver us from the power and the practice of every sin, graft in our hearts the supreme love of God and goodness, enlighten our understanding, help our infirmities, elevate our thoughts and feelings, spiritualize all our affections, and thus prepare us for that Holy place into which nothing that defileth can enter and where the pure in heart see God and are for ever like God.

Let us ever remember that the Spirit of the Lord is here ; with us, ready to take up His abode in us. Let us "grieve" Him not by our indifference to His presence, our unwillingness to receive Him, or our worldly and carnal lives, lest we drive Him to depart. For He cannot enter into the heart that is unwilling or unfit to receive Him.

The best of us indeed is all unworthy of so great and gracious a Guest ; but He will not pass by the truly contrite ; He loves to dwell with the humble spirit, and those who hunger and thirst after righteousness He will surely satisfy.

"Spirit of purity and grace,
Our weakness, pitying see :
O make our hearts Thy dwelling place,
And worthier Thee."

THE CHRISTIAN IN THE WORLD.

By The Rev. H. M. MAYNARD.

Sermon Preached at Christ Church, Spitalfields, on January 2nd, 1890.

"I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil."—St. John xvii. 15.

IN all the ages of this world's history there have been thinking men—men who have not been content merely to accept what their fathers have told them or believe a thing to be truth, merely because custom and tradition have handed it down as such, but men who have been bold and original and earnest enough to look into the matter for themselves, to take the trouble to investigate, to try their utmost to get at the Truth.

This has been especially the case with religion ; nearly all philosophers have turned their attention to this, and tried to discover the relations between God and man—by a natural instinct implanted by the Almighty all agreed in recognising some Deity, though they differed as to what were His attributes, and His relations to mankind. Some for instance said God cared not for men any more than for flies or any other of the lowest forms of life ; while others took the opposite extreme, and approached near enough to the truth to assert, "We also are His offspring."

But the very best of the philosophers, and those who approached most nearly to the truth, could only say with Pilate, "What is truth." They could not be certain ; all was still hazy, and misty, and obscure, till the light of the glorious Gospel shone into men's hearts, giving perfect satisfaction, supplying the inmost cravings of their hearts, and presenting itself irresistibly to their minds as the truth.

But though men's eyes have now been opened, and the majority of the civilised and enlightened world embraces Christianity as truth, yet there is still much that is and ever must remain in obscurity.

It is not in accordance with God's wise purpose to make to mankind a full revelation.

This would restrain the voluntary powers too much, would call for no exercise of candour, seriousness, humility, enquiry, no habits of reflection, above all, it would hinder the development of that simple childlike faith and trust in God as our Father, which is essential for our happiness here and hereafter.

Yes, though God wants us to use the intellect He has given us, wants us to take the trouble to look into matters of such great importance as the future life, to which in our inmost hearts we know we all must come, to be quite sure that we understand aright our relation to God, and the ground of our hope of spending a happy and glorious eternity with Him, nevertheless He also wants us to trust Him, and leave things we do not now understand in His all-wise hands, believing that in His own good time He will make them plain to us. But our religion is also meant to be practical. It should come into our every-day life. We must recognise God's hand in everything that befalls us here on earth, and happily and confidently trust Him to order our various paths in life, even though He see fit to do so in a way we cannot understand, a way that does not seem best to us.

We are standing on the threshold of a new year. Most of it still lies wrapt in obscurity and darkness—our path unknown,

Are any here wondering, may be dreading, what may befall them in it?

Perhaps they look back on the year just past and see how it has been but one struggle with temptation —temptation, alas, but too often yielded to; or God may have seen fit to lead them along a thorny path and their trials and troubles have been almost more than they could bear, so that looking forward into the coming year, and seeing all dim and dark before them, the same weary round of sorrow and temptations looming in the unknown future, they feel downcast and hopeless, and maybe the thought has come, Why was I born into this world at all? Why could not God have provided that I should go at once to heaven, instead of dragging out here a life that is a failure, a life in which sin is continually getting the mastery, and troubles and trials far outweigh the joys of my existence?

On such I would urge the consideration of the words of my text: "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil."

Now we must notice that these words form a prayer of our Lord to His heavenly Father on behalf of His disciples. They were uttered at a very solemn period of Christ's life, just before He was about to end His earthly ministry, and leave His disciples alone in the midst of a world of enemies. And yet, though He prays, "Father, I will that those whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am," He does not pray that they should leave the world at once to come and be with Him, but "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world."

Was it because He did not know the wickedness of the world? Nay, no one knew better than our Lord its nature and character. He knew its hollowness and deceit; its opposition to all that was good and Christ-like; its hatred of Himself and His people.

He knew, too, its trials and troubles; for thirty-three years had He cast in His lot in this vale of tears, enduring the contradiction of sinners against Himself. This world had indeed ever been but a dry, barren land to the Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, to the Son of Man who had not where to lay His head.

Again He was tempted, and tried in all points like unto ourselves, so well knew the deadly power of temptation, the crafty wiles of the evil one. He knew, too, the weakness of His people. He could look into their hearts and see how they were stained and corrupted with sin. And He could foresee that at the time of His greatest need, in the last dread hour, His disciples would all forsake Him and flee; and that he of their number, who had been most emphatic in declaring his unalterable fidelity, would be the very one to thrice openly deny Him.

And yet, though knowing all this, and yearning over His disciples with infinite love, He was nevertheless willing to leave them, weak as they were, in the midst of a hostile world, in the midst of temptations, trials and sufferings.

Ah, it was because He knew it was necessary; man must learn by bitter experience his own weakness, and absolute dependence on Divine aid; he needs thus to be fitted and prepared for heaven. Just as iron ore needs to go through the furnace and be purified from all dross before it is fit to be manufactured, just as a child needs schooling before he is fit to enter life's battle, so we need the schooling of many a fiery trial and fierce temptation; we must pass through the schooltime of this life to train us for the life to come, to make us meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

It is for this reason our Lord prays, "Take them not out of the world, but leave them for a time to learn their own need and weakness and emptiness, so that they may then be led to seek the strength which is at their hand to use," to learn the blessed reality of the Father's loving keeping.

Again, keep them from the evil."

What then is this evil from which our Lord prays we should be kept? Does it consist in outward tribulation, in the trials and troubles of life, in poverty, bereavements, bodily sufferings? I think not.

Christ knew that man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward. He Himself, as Perfect Man, underwent all these, leaving us the one perfect example of patient submission to God's will. It was indeed for this purpose that He left His Father's throne to come and live amongst us on this earth, that there might be no thorny path or barren wilderness of trouble, which He as our great Leader had not passed through before us, no fierce temptation which He as Perfect Man had not experienced and triumphed over, thus leaving us an example that we should follow His steps, and in all these things be more than conquerors.

So then this evil from which He prays God to keep us is not an outward one, but one far more deadly and subtle—an inward and spiritual hurt. He prays that we may be kept from the wiles of the evil one, who as a roaring lion goeth about seeking whom he may devour, from any indulged sin that would come between us and God, from any earthly care or pleasure that might deaden our spiritual faculties and separate the soul from the enjoyment of God's love.

Outward troubles, failures, difficulties, disappointments will, under God's hand, only loosen the bonds of the world around us, and cause us to cling more closely to our heavenly Father, who in the divine crucible can and will make them all to work together for our good. But from this inward and spiritual evil we do indeed need to be kept, for we cannot overcome sin ourselves. Christ would not have prayed, "Father keep them" if we could possibly keep ourselves, nor would He have taught us to pray, "Deliver us from evil."

We must feel day by day the vital need of being kept, for the sooner we discover our own weakness the sooner shall we be led to the true source of strength, and distrusting self put our whole trust and confidence in Him who is able to save to the uttermost.

Yes, a full persuasion of our own nothingness lies at the root of all our comfort and safety and happy walking with God.

This is indeed a hard lesson to learn. Are we learning it under God's training?

Perhaps when first we came to God we thought what great things we would do in His service, we would be something, men should soon take knowledge of us that we had been with Jesus; but then in time of trial we failed, some temptation got the mastery over us, we could not stand its test, but miserably succumbed, not only once, but over and over again, and on looking back we are disappointed and disheartened, we have made fresh discoveries of our own vileness and weakness, so look into the coming year with dread and despondency, and perhaps almost despair.

But, Christian brethren, let us take courage. The lesson we have to learn that "without Me ye can do nothing" has yet its glorious counterpart: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." And though with many a tear it may be, still step by step we shall at length learn that the only safe position is when we can sing, "None of self and all of Thee."

O let that be our motto for this year, then how sweet to know that Christ will take our nothing and use it for His glory, working in us and through us and by us.

Whatever we do or suffer He will be close by our side; the narrow road is still broad enough for two, and He will guide us along it, holding our hand tight in His own, and will keep us, but it must be in His own way, and according to His own will. He knows the path best suited for each of us, and we must trustfully let Him choose it for us and lead us along it.

It is just because the way may be so rugged, so dark, and intricate, because it may be so dangerous, lonely and sad that He will keep our feet, keep all our bones, so that not one of them shall be broken—keep us as the Good Shepherd keeps His sheep, as the apple of His eye, with unslumbering watchfulness, holding our hand tight and keeping us in perfect peace, so that we may trustfully say, "Though a thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand, it shall not come nigh thee."

My brethren, Jesus has pleaded and is pleading to-night, "Father, keep them from the evil." Shall we determine by God's grace to go through this year trusting to His glorious promises? Shall we take Him at His word, and going to Him as guilty, lost sinners, confess our utter vileness and weakness, our sins and shortcomings, our inability to conquer sin ourselves or do any good thing in His sight—our dreads for the future, lest we should fall even more miserably than we have done before, dreads lest our troubles and temptations should be greater than we could bear?

Oh, He is a loving, sympathising Saviour, He is yearning over each one of us here with infinite love, longing for us to trust Him, trust Him with our soul's salvation, trust Him for eternity, trust Him now in our daily life, believe that He will order everything, every little circumstance of our lives, as shall be best for our happiness here, and eternal welfare hereafter.

Shall we not then let this loving Saviour have the love of all our hearts? Shall we not lean on Him, trust fully in Him, make Him a personal Friend.

Then we shall not dread the coming years, for we shall have a Friend by us that sticketh closer than a brother. One who by experience knoweth the way that we tread so can and will be our best Guide. One who since He likewise was compassed about with infirmities, knows and can sympathise with ours. One who is the Great Physician, and knowing our frame, remembereth that we are but dust. With Him at our side we can boldly say, "The Lord is my Helper; I will not fear what man doeth unto me."

Then in the great hereafter when we shall know even as also we are known, when things that now are dark mysteries to us, will then be open and manifest. Then we shall see that however dark, however tangled and mysterious has been our life, yet it has indeed been overruled for the best by a loving hand. And like Jacob we shall joyfully testify to the goodness of "God who fed me all my life long to this day the Covenant Angel which redeemed me."

"The clouds hang heavy round my way,
I cannot see,
But through the darkness I believe
God leadeth me.
'Tis sweet to keep my hand in His
While all is dim,
To close my weary, aching eyes,
And follow Him.

Through many a thorny path He leads
My tired feet,
Through many a path of tears to go,
But it is sweet
To know that He is close to me.
My God, my Guide,
He leadeth me, and so I walk
Quite satisfied."

THE *Daily Chronicle* says that according to the report of the Church Estates Commissioners the work of the year consisted entirely of the purchase of a leasehold interest for forty years of a house in Lincoln Cathedral-close, and the sale of a copyhold of inheritance in Carlisle on the payment of £15 10s.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1890.

A YEAR WITH THE GERMAN REEDS.—I.

IN a recent article, "The Clergy and the Play," we referred to this well-known entertainment as furnishing a healthful and sensible recreation apart from the theatre, concert, or music hall. With neither as these, as such, is it the business of of a religious paper to occupy itself; but, in so far as they *all* appeal to human nature in its *effusive* element, so to speak, and are intended, directly or indirectly, to raise or lower the standard of moral perception, there is much in music and the drama which calls for study and discussion from the pulpit, the press, and the family circle. We need no excuse, therefore, for an occasional notice of anything of interest in what is called the artistic world. One great and growing problem for the clergy and their parochial helpers is how to regulate and direct into the most wholesome channels the imitative and musical faculties of the masses. We cannot *repress* these tendencies—we should be unnatural if we did. The former, with that appreciation of good acting which draws men so largely, is Nature's homage to the true interpretation of character, while the love of sweet sounds needs no analysis or apology. Two things should be borne in mind in this work. First, the great danger of the drama lies in its *tragic*, not its comic side. Tragedy too often derives its seductive allurement from being based upon and extenuating crime and licence. Its insidious attraction lies here—that it is unperceived, whereas the coarse jest or the *double entendre* of the music hall is obvious at once. The stage piece, then, which is based upon the penny novelette is a bane to society. The second observation we would make is, that it is not so much the cleverly-interwoven *plot*, as the clever interpretation put upon it, that deserves recognition on the stage. What a difference between Mr. Brandram's rendering of some classical recitation and that which we lately heard at a village penny reading! A girl of fourteen was to make her *début* (or shall we not rather say her *exposé*). She stumbled on to the platform, placed her arms akimbo, rustled her unbecoming skirts of some gorgeous pattern, and with her single eye (having lost one!) fixed upon the ceiling, vociferated: "I dramt thot I dwalt in marble orls!" And the same remark applies with even greater force to acting and music. By all and every means take your family, and encourage your people to hear and appreciate, and if that be their bent, to imitate *really good* artistic exposition, and care less for the elaborate and finished character of the work than for the talent of those who produce it. Of the application of this principle we have an admirable example in the German Reed's Entertainment. The pieces they perform are well written of their kind, and the music is always excellent. But the authors labour under a disadvantage. No complication in the plot can be made. One hour and a half is their limit. Then the object is *to amuse* only. Mind, intelligent amusement, not silly farce. The *pathetic* aspect is not called out except incidentally, as in the case of the usurped property in "Brittany Folk," and the bewitching but helpless maid who required the assistance of the English Tourist-Barrister who stepped in between her and the churlish Tonyk. Then comes another difficulty, but one which is met and solved by the patient perseverance of Mr. Alfred Reed. *He* is an actor "to the manner born;" but for all that, his professional education included the musical training which is essential where one has to combine the actor and the musician, not in himself alone, but in all the members of his caste, for *singing* is indispensable to this form of entertainment. Of the performers and the pieces rendered during the past year we shall speak in another article; and of the audience, we must say that it is invariably one of the best conducted in London or out of it. As specimens of those whom we have met at St. George's Hall, we may mention first the master of a merchant vessel, whose enjoyment was hearty when he saw "Ben Bouncer" dance the hornpipe; the children of a well-known manager of a music hall, who delighted in some of Mr. Grain's schoolboy snatches; and a boyish-looking curate of some 29 summers, who, at the conclusion of the performance, with a conscious blush introduced us to "the lady I am engaged to," after they had for their edification heard "Sing, Tommy the Curate, Oh!" One word more. Whatever you do, put down all attempts at acting where there is no real talent, just as much as you would refuse to receive into your choir the boy who hopelessly sang through his nose a semitone below pitch.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion Explained and Established." By Maurice Day, D.D., Bishop of Cashel and Waterford. Dublin : Hodges, Figgis and Co.

Having previous acquaintance with the Bishop of Cashel's theological opinions, we looked mainly to his teaching on the two Sacraments—as to Orders, he seems perfectly sound, that the three Orders were instituted by the Apostles themselves. But now we turn to Baptism, and its Grace of Regeneration. As the term is a hard one, we will give it the explanation of the Catechism, "being made children of Grace," or, as the service has it "embraced in the arms of His mercy." Who can doubt that this takes place in Baptism, nay, in a certain sense at the infant's birth? None can unsay this, excepting those who, denying that God is loving unto every man, will have it that some infants are by a decree doomed to perdition. This is as if God were a Moloch, thrusting into flames infants placed in His arms. No one else will deny that He embraces every infant, sealing His adoption of it in the Sacrament of Baptism. What is the charitable hypothesis? Surely it must be that what we assert of *all* is true of *some?* But this is not the Bishop's theory. It is, not that anything takes place at any infant's Baptism, but that hereafter, on its repentance and faith, it will be regenerated. The Bishop makes what is asserted of all, impossible to any—monstrous incongruity ! To all, I say, no one can be regenerated without faith and repentance. So much for infants. Next, as to adults : the unfit are not regenerated. There remains only the fit—but they, according to his theory, were regenerated when they had faith and repentance. Thus what is ascribed to God and man as having taken place in all, is impossible in any. Was there ever such a contradiction as this? What should we think of the blessed Reformers if they could have made such a muddle? We turn now to the 28th article, which treats of the Holy Euchurist. The Bishop has it that neither Bible nor Prayer Book speak of a presence. This is strange. How can there be a Communion or a partaking of the Body of Christ, if there is nothing present to be communicated or partaken of? If our Lord's Body be confined to Heaven, His gracious influences are not. May not His Body be present, as the sun, by power and influence, as Ridley told his judges? We are glad to see that the Bishop does not deny bread to be a means to the faithful, though the Revision Report, which he adopted, denies any other means but faith. We were in hopes that, on the 4th article, the Bishop would have shown how our Lord's Body is now a natural body, though spiritual; and how it can be spiritually, though not materially, present. But we find nothing. Some one said lately that nothing but what is material can be hid under a veil. But this contradicts the Catechism. The outward part is the means, or veil, whereby we receive the inward. Thus, His garment was the veil, which conveyed health to the woman who touched. Health was with the garment ; yet not to the unbelieving throng, but only to her who had faith. Of his Lordship's remarks on the other articles, we say nothing. The subject being not open to controversy, we take it for granted that they are orthodox.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

EVOLUTION.

Sir,—The concluding paragraph of my last letter should read: "If Mr. Henslow is satisfied with the result of his somewhat Machiavellian scheme—which, as he has now confessed, I will forgive—namely, that his first letter was written, not to convince, but to 'draw out Mr. Evans to reply,' I have no great reason to complain. I did reply, and certain it is that Mr. Henslow has made no perceptible impression on any single one of the positions established in my letter." In the paragraph numbered 2, the printer has inadvertently omitted the prefix before Mr. Henslow's name. One or two minor corrections I pass over.

2. With reference to Mr. Murphy's letter in the current Pulpit, I beg to say that I shall await with interest (though with perfect equanimity), the volume which he says is needed to answer my letter of May 31st. Meanwhile the various propositions maintained therein must continue to hold the field. Mr. Murphy certainly has not disproved them any more than Mr. Henslow. In spite of all that Mr. Murphy can urge, it is plain that the authority of Sir Charles Lyell, of great weight when he speaks as *Geologist*, is of very little account when he speaks as *Evolutionist.* In his old age, impressed by Darwin's persistency and Professor Huxley's audacity, he is content, after much wavering, simply to eat his own published words : "Species have a real existence in Nature, and each was endowed at the time of Creation with the attributes and organisation by which it is now distinguished." Most of the facts and reasons which led him to this deliberate decision (which, as Darwin himself confesses, is the decision of "the most eminent palæontologists . . . . and all our greatest geologists") must have remained unchanged after Lyell had been persuaded out of his original opinion and had executed his *pas seul*, or rather *tour de force*, and had turned "right about face."

3. It also remains a fact that the specialist is usually summoned to *give evidence* (not always very valuable); he is *not*, as a rule, appointed *Judge.* For instance, take the specialist as to handwriting. He often gives evidence in will-cases and other important trials, but not only is he not elevated to the Judicial Bench, but judge and jury have sometimes concurred in a verdict which totally rejected the most emphatic testimony and the most cherished conviction of the specialist. The same is true of other professional witnesses. Only a week or two ago, Mr. Justice Day observed, in a horse warranty case, that "the thing that had most impressed him was the conflict of medical evidence. He could not but think that if any one wanted to know the age of a horse he had better not consult a veterinary surgeon." Too often it has happened that such specialists have contradicted each other as flatly as if they had been Scientists and Evolutionists.

As the hapless engineer is sometimes hoist by his own petar, so it is not unfrequently the misfortune of the specialist to be ignominiously carried captive by his own theory, to which he falls an easy prey. There can be only one person less fitted than Darwin for exercising, in this case, judicial functions. That one person is Professor Huxley. Darwin was a man of one idea ; Professor Huxley, by his arrogant dogmat-

ism and violent diatribes, has shown himself a most bigoted partisan, and he has already had to confess his ridiculous mistake about *Bathybius*.

4. What Sir John Herschel wrote in 1836 may be of interest to the antiquarian, but it cannot upset Herschel's opinion, expressed after the appearance of the "Origin of Species" (in 1859), that Darwin's theory was "the Law of Higgledy Piggledy," nor can it diminish the force of the statement in Mr. Gladstone's paper of 1886: "Among the persons of very high authority in Natural Science . . . who held the general accordance of the Mosaic cosmogony with the results of modern enquiry, are Cuvier and *Sir John Herschel*."

5. Mr. Murphy, granting that Carlyle, Lord Hatherley, and Mr. Thring represent between them "literary force, legal acuteness, and knowledge of human nature," asks: "Would these powers enable men to weigh scientific evidence, or even to see its relevancy?" Science professes to deal with knowledge, and to supply accurate, trustworthy, not to say useful, information as to things in general. This being so, evolution (especially in the form of Darwinism) comes forward, offering us a beautifully simple and wonderfully plausible scientific theory to account for the phenomena of the Universe, and to elucidate "the burden and the mystery of this most unintelligible world." These three eminent men, who all reached old age, and had (in different ways) great experience of life, who all won the regard and approval of their contemporaries, unite in declaring that, so far from solving the problems of existence or throwing light on the mystery of life, its origin, meaning, conduct, issue —nay, so far from adding to our store of useful knowledge (as true science ought to do), evolution only darkens counsel, and makes confusion worse confounded—that, in a word, it is a wretched imposture, or at least delusion, only mocking man's misery, and leading him further astray, and so they call it "Stuff! Babble!! Insanity!!!" Common sense is likely to require many tons of scientific evidence to outweigh the forcibly-expressed opinion of these thoughtful, experienced, and distinguished men.

H. HEBER EVANS.

June 14th, 1890.

P.S.—I commend the following quotations from the "Origin of Species" (6th edition, pp. 222, 226, 233) to all interested in the subject of these letters. Darwin says: "Natural selection acts only by the accumulation of slight modifications of structure or instinct, each profitable to the individual under its conditions of life."

"Peculiar habits confined to the workers or sterile females, however long they might be followed, could not possibly affect the males and fertile females, which alone leave descendants."

It is needless to point out that in the case of the hive-bee it is *only* "the workers or sterile females" that build the cells, the geometrical principles and mathematical accuracy of which cannot be understood and appreciated without a higher knowledge of mathematics than is always to be found in our schools and colleges.

And yet Darwin is so nearly a monomaniac (so entirely possessed by his one pet theory of Natural Selection) as to declare: "I believe that the hive-bee has acquired, through Natural Selection, her inimitable architectural powers." Could the force of evolutionary folly further go?

H. H. E.

WHO TAKES SCRIPTURE LITERALLY?

SIR,—Rome takes her stand on the pretence that she alone understands the words, "This is My Body," literally. But does she? She says that, by the words, "This is My Body," the change of bread into His Body is effected. But, if so, they were not true, when uttered. The same words cannot declare a change past, and yet produce that change. Cardinal Wiseman says that "this" does not mean bread: for that it would be a contradiction to say, "this bread is My Body." If it were, "this bread I now make My Body," or "this bread shall be My Body," it would be a different matter. The words, therefore, cannot be taken literally. If they turn the bread into His Body, they are not true; and if they are true when uttered they do not produce the change. Take our Lord's turning the water into wine. If, after the change, He said, this is wine, the change had taken place before. If He said, I now make this water wine the change would follow His words. But Rome does not take "this is My Body" literally. She must either mean this thing has already been changed into My Body; or else, this bread shall be changed by My words into My Body.

(2.) But, besides, she founds on these words what they do not say. She has it, "this is My Body, blood, soul, and divinity." This is founded on a philosophical axiom, that wherever His Body is there is His Divinity. I need not ask whether His Divinity was present when His Body hung, or lay, dead. The assumption is, that His Body is grossly in the wafer; and that therefore His Divinity is present there also. But as the first is not true we need not argue about the consequence. It is well worthy of notice, that our Lord says not, this is Myself: but merely, this is My Body. The only thing that looks like such an assertion is what we have in St. John vi. 57, "He that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me." But this is only tantamount to what we have in verse 50, "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die." The bread, which came down from heaven, of which we are to eat, is His Divinity, which alone came down from heaven. The whole literal meaning fails. Our Lord's "This is My Body," must be in accordance with St. Paul's "the bread which we break is the κοινωνιά of the Body of Christ." But, as St. Peter says, "The heavens are to retain our Lord until the restitution of all things"; this must mean His Body, as His Divinity is omnipresent. St. Paul's κοινωνιά therefore must be such a communication, or partaking of our Lord's Body as is consistent with its being retained locally and corporeally, or substantially, in Heaven.

It is most extraordinary how men will prove one piece of nonsense by another more outrageous still. I have before me a book of Sermons, preached in a Romish chapel in Dublin, by a Rev. Richard Hayes, and published by Nolan, Suffolk-street, 1822. This gentleman did not preach *extempore*. If so, that would account for its nonsense. If he did, at least he wrote his sermons out afterwards. No doubt he showed them to friends, and with their sanction printed them. Now, hear what he says in order to prove that our Lord's body may be in many places at once. At p. 15 of his first sermon we read:—"Our own weak minds can conceive a mode for its possibility. Nay, every body while in motion must be at every single moment in more than one place. For if for one moment it were in only one place, it would be

so the next and the next, and thus motionless for ever. It must, therefore, every moment be in motion, be in more than one place, and the quicker it moves the more places it must be in at every single moment of the motion. If then it be accelerated *ad infinitum*, it will be in every part of all space at any one moment. Thus motion itself of any kind, which, because we see we think we understand, is, in reality, not more possible than the simultaneous existence of Christ's body in different places."

Job says, "Oh that mine adversary had written a book"! But better still, oh that he had given his reason! I do not know how far Ritualists go on these lines with Rome, or, indeed, whether there is any separation at all between the two. By stopping at Consubstantiation they may avoid the difficulties of a change of substance, but all those attending a body being in more places at once await them still.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

WE understand that it is proposed by two Canons of our cathedral, both well known as writers of English Church History, to publish, conjointly, the lives of the Bishops of Lincoln from the establishment of the see at Lincoln to the present time. Both of the writers have been for a long time beneficed in the diocese, and both were on the foundation of a college founded by Bishops of Lincoln, and of which the Bishop of Lincoln is visitor.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Andrews, Rev. W. S., M.A., Perpetual Curate of the Chapel Royal, Brighton; Rector of Wicken, Northants.
Ballcine, Rev. J. A., M.A., Vicar of Yarnton; Vicar of St. Mary's, Acock's-green, Birmingham.
Browne, Rev. Arthur Heber, M.A., Vicar of Northleach.
Bulkeley, Rev. H. J., M.A., Vicar of Lanercost; Rector of Morpeth.
Burns, Rev. W. H., M.A., Rector of Clayton, Manchester; Vicar of Dacre, Penrith.
Carroll, Rev. T., M.A., Vicar of Whitton, Hounslow.
Churton, Rev. Canon, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans.
Coates, Rev. C. H., M.A., Chaplain to the *Cambridge* (temporary).
Connor, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Nicholas, Birmingham; Vicar of Alnwick and Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland.
Dunkin, Rev. Henry, M.A., Head Master of the Dorset County School, near Dorchester.
Dyer, Rev. H. J., B.A., Curate of Richmond, Surrey; Vicar of Menstone-in-Wharfedale, Leeds.
Griffiths, Rev. Benjamin Parry, M.A., Vicar of Llanwenog, Cardiganshire.
Hetling, Rev. F. T., Rector of Essendon and Chaplain to the Marquis of Salisbury; Vicar of Christ Church, Albany-street.
Hoskins, Rev. E., M.A., Rector of St. Martin, Ludgate, with St. Mary Magdalen, Old Fish-street, and St. Gregory by St. Paul.
Jerrom, Rev. H. J., Chaplain to London Hospital.
Jones, Rev. Charles, Curate of St. John's, Cheetham, Curate-in-Charge of All Saints', Habergham, Burnley.
Kelly, Rev. Richard Charles Nugent, British Chaplain at Gothenburg; Vicar of Formby and Torquay, Tasmania.
Lloyd, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of Carmarthen; Residentiary Canon in St. David's Cathedral.
Maude, Rev. J. H., M.A., Dean of Hertford College, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans.
Medd, Rev. Canon, Rector of North Cerney, Cirencester; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans.
Meynell, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vice-Provost of Denstone College; Prebendary of Gaia Major in Lichfield Cathedral.
Morgan, Rev. Philip, late Curate of the Lickey, Diocese of Worcester; Vicar of Llandilo'rfan-with-Llanfihangel-Nanthran, Breconshire.
Noakes, Rev. Arthur John, M.A., Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Ponder's End.
Ough, Rev. Charles, late of St. John's, Islington; Incumbent of Christ Church, Ore, Hastings.
Philipps, Rev. John Erasmus, Vicar of Enstone, Oxon.
Ridgeway, Very Rev. F. E., Dean of Glasgow; Vicar of St. Peter's, Cranley Gardens.
Robinson, Rev. E. M., Rector of St. John's, Smalley.
Rugg, Rev. H. H., Preacher in the Diocese of London.
Rugg, Rev. William Robert, M.A., Vicar of Beoley, Redditch.
Salman, Rev. J. S., M.A., Vicar of Lastingham, Pickering.
Sargent, Rev. J. F., Vicar of Salcombe, Devonshire.
Schapira, Rev. A., East London Clergyman.
Scholefield, Rev. C. C., M.A., Chaplain of Eton College; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Knightsbridge.
Scott, Rev. Thomas Errington, M.A., Vicar of Weaverham; Vicar of Norton, Stockton-on-Tees.
Seeley, Rev. Edward, Minister of the Martyrs' District, Leicester.
Slater, Rev. Francis, M.A., Vicar of St. Giles's, and St. Peter's, Cambridge; Honorary Canon of Ely Cathedral.
Smith, Rev. Sidney Coleridge, M.A., Rector of Rodney Stoke, Weston-super-Mare.
Symonds, Rev. W. H., Senior Curate; Vicar of Idle, Yorkshire.
Taylor, Rev. Richard Hunsley, M.A., Vicar of Cleasby, Darlington; Rector of Derrylane, Diocese of Kilmore, Ireland.
Urmson, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of Willington, Durham.
Watson, Rev. Arthur Hawtrey, B.A., Vicar of Kineton, Warwickshire.
Weir, Rev. E. H., Chaplain at Stockholm.
White, Rev. John, Vicar of Dacre, Penrith; Rector of Clayton, Manchester.
Wilkinson, Rev. Christopher George, M.A., Curate of Keighley; Vicar of Emu Bay, Tasmania.
Wilkinson, Rev. John Farrar, M.A., Rector of Folkton, Yorkshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bancks, the Rev. Gerard, B.A., of Dalton Parsonage, at Stanground Manor House, on the 27th ult., aged 60.
Bogie, the Rev. Brackenbury Dickson, B.A., Rector of Lusby-with-Asgarby (having held the former living for sixty-two years), on the 26th ult., aged 87.
Freeman, Rev. Francis Elton, M.A., of Castle Froome, Herefordshire, at Eastbourne, on the 4th ult., aged 55.
Hebert, Rev. Charles, D.D., formerly Vicar of Ambleside and of Lechlade, and Rector of Burslem and Lowestoft, at 1, Marine Terrace, Silloth, on the 23rd ult., aged 82.
Kirwan, Rev. E. D. G. M., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and some time Vicar of Wooton Wawen, at Dover, on the 27th ult.
Mayor, Rev. Joseph, for thirty years Rector of Cossington, at Cossington Rectory, Leicester, on the 25th ult.
Perry, Rev. George Henry Augustus, Vicar of Soulbury, Bucks, on Midsummer-day, 1890, aged 67. Interred at Shenfield.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CAN GOD BE KNOWN BY HUMAN WISDOM?

By the Rev. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER, M.A., LL.D., Curate of St. Mary-le-Strand.

Sermon Preached in the Church of St. Mary-le-Strand, London, on Sunday, June 22nd, 1890.

"For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greek foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."—1 Cor. i., 22, 23, 24.

THAT a Divine existence has been acknowledged throughout all recorded time, is evidenced by the numerous hieroglyphical remains discovered upon the exhumed historical stone-lore of the most ancient known inhabitants of the world. This evidence is confirmed by the statements of many heathen authors, and authoritatively confirmed by the expressions of heathens as they are cited in Holy Writ; and confirmation of the fact is culminated, by the witness borne to it by the spiritual instincts and religious rites discovered to exist amongst savage man in all regions of the earth. Yet, notwithstanding the universal acknowledgment of a Divine existence, the characteristics of its nature, and the meaning of its movements, have been more or less misconceived, when not wholly unknown.

Now, the text drives us to three consecutive points of consideration with reference to, not the mere acknowledgment of God's existence, but the knowledge of Him Whom to know is life eternal. First: It urges us to consider the manner in which a wonderful people, the Jews, brought into supernatural communication with God by signs and wonders of His presence, made the peculiar recipients of His personal favour, nevertheless, disputing His authority, and choosing rather to follow the evil waywardness of self-will, lapsed, and rejected the true knowledge of God as manifested to them in the revelation of Christ the Messiah. Second: To consider how another great people, the Greeks, who felt after God by intuition and reason, "if haply they might find Him," who felt Him in the quickening monitions of conscience, and reasoned about His existence from the evidence of design, and arrived at the conviction that such a Being existed as the Maker and Preserver of all things,—how they vainly essayed to know God by their own natural efforts, to analyse His nature and to solve His essence,—that God of whom certain of their own poets said, "We are His offspring,"—that God in Whom, as the Apostle to the Gentiles proclaimed, "they lived and moved and had their being." Third: The text asserts that by the preaching of Christ crucified, the wayward self-will of the Jew was to be brought into subjection to the power of God; and the willing mind of the Greek was to be opened to receive the full light of the wisdom of God, revealed, by free grace, full as the light which floods the Creator's natural universe.

In the contrary cases of the Jews and the Greeks, we have exemplified the two halves of a nut in theology, the twin and yet separate existence of free grace and free will. The Jews had free grace and repulsed it; the Greeks had of free will the desire for the knowledge of God; and, when the times of the Gentiles were come, by free grace they were to have the knowledge of God, which knowledge undoubtedly had of grace been bestowed in individual cases. "For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not."

For the Jews require a Sign.—Of the Hebrews their royal bard declared, "The Lord hath chosen Israel for His peculiar treasure." Thus chosen, they were honoured by Jehovah for nigh upon two thousand years with a sublime succession of signs and wonders,—omens of Omnipotence,—whereby He revealed himself to them as the only and true God, and gave them assurance upon assurance that it was His pleasure to be their covenant-keeping Father, if they would be His covenant-abiding children. By signs and wonders God educated this elect people into a knowledge of Himself, and instructed them in His moral law, as the preliminary training for a higher degree in spiritual discipline, "For the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." Patriarch, lawgiver, judge, king, and prophet, all, when interpreting God's will to His chosen people, entreated and were granted signs to clothe them with authority, and inspire them with confidence in the declaration of His will. Such signs, for instance, as the wondrous splendour of the Divine Shechinah, that appeared glowing in the bush whose roots were anchored in the "Mountain of God,"—that flaming splendour which reappeared in magnified glory on the cope of heaven, as the pillar of fire, the Divine torch, to light the way to freedom and the land of promise:—or, as the dew-dropping manna, shed by the lavish Hand Divine to sustain the famishing frames of the wandering Israelitish host:—or, as the limpid water that leaped from the smitten rock at Mount Horeb, and flowed in welcome floods to the thirsting multitudes encamped at Rephidim. No further need to describe the remarkable consecutions of seasonable signs and wonders, denoting the special presence of God amongst the Hebrews throughout the various

epochs embraced in Old Testament history. And to the last typical Jew, as St. Paul previous to his conversion might be termed, still was the sign granted, when on the road to Damascus to him was revealed in the glory of the Shechinah, the visible presence of the Son of God. Now, the custom of *receiving* signs inbred a second nature in the Jew to *require* signs—"For the Jews require a sign."

Passing over the long series of idolatries into which the chosen people lapsed and relapsed, from the day they bowed in calf-worship, till the hour of their grossest darkness of idolatry which lost them in the night of their Great Captivity—passing thence onward, we behold even the remnant of Judah turn renegade upon their God-Messiah when He appeared in their midst; and we behold Herod, their king, who swayed in Roman interest Judah's royal sceptre, seeking to slay the Prince-Deliverer while He yet lay cradled in the helplessness of infancy. Truly unto the Jews was Christ in the cradle, and Christ on the cross, a stumbling-block. When their persecuted Messiah walked amongst them, their infatuation for signs and wonders still continuing, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians, sought from Him a sign from heaven. He, sighing deeply in spirit, compassionating their blind prejudice of habit for signs, which blinded their conscience, the eye of their will, said to those blind leaders of the blind,—"Why doth this generation seek after a sign?"—"Oh, ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but cannot ye discern the signs of the times? A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it but the sign of the prophet Jonas." The men of Nineveh should rise in judgment with that generation, and should condemn it, because they repented at the preaching of Jonas. After *three days*' preaching of Jonas the Gentile Ninevites repented; after *three years*' preaching of their Saviour and God the Jews were still an evil and adulterous generation. They crucified Him, and Christ crucified became their stumbling-block. Their carnal minds had made a temporal king the heart-idol of their expectation. Ezekiel had predicted of them: "These men have set up their idols in their heart, and put the stumbling-block of their iniquity before their face. . . . . They are all estranged from Me through their idols." And the word of the Lord went forth against every one of such men: "I will set My face against that man, and will make him a sign and a proverb, and I will cut him off from the midst of My people; and ye shall know that I am the Lord." Thus, through the hardship of punishment should come to the Jew the knowledge of God.

And the Greeks seek after Wisdom.—As the Jews by signs, so the Greeks by the plummet of human wisdom, sought to sound the unfathomable depths of God's nature, and bring to the surface of human sense, theorems of His polity towards mankind. And it is remarkable that although the Jews had the advantage of revelation by signs and wonders of God amongst them, they were more mistaken in their anticipations of Emmanuel, God with us, than were the Greeks deceived in their philosophical speculations concerning the nature of the Divine Being, and the idiocrasy of the human soul. Why were the Jews so mistaken? Because with them Emmanuel was mistaken to be a temporal Messiah, a king indeed, but a king after the order of Saul, David, or Solomon; one who should fulfil the proud dreams of vengeful Jewish ambition; one who should plant his foot upon the neck of their temporal enemies, trample them in his fury, and dye his kingly robes a more imperial stain in the blood of their enemies. Oh, "the less than littleness" of their ambition! They understood not the meaning of their God-given signs and wonders; that they were sent to forecast the most wondrous sign of all—their God to come in lowliest guise amongst them, a spiritual King, a moral Conqueror, with a sovereignity which should not terminate with a mortal life, and a dynasty which should not expire in a few brief generations, Whose kingship is co-equal with the Creator's own, and Whose kingdom is coeval with the duration of eternity.

By the Greeks, on the other hand, through natural revelation, the spiritual nature of the Deity seems to have been apprehended in the abstract as a light to the Gentiles, even before Emmanuel became, by the supernatural manifestation of Himself in the flesh, "the Light to lighten the Gentiles and the Glory of His people Israel." For centuries before Christ the Wisdom of God appeared, the Greeks were renowned for their varied and searching philosophical theories as to the nature of God, and man's relation to Him; as to a future state of existence; and for hypotheses about the great enigma, the origin of evil. They were anxious about the future condition of the soul, the soul which the purer forms of their philosophy asserted had a superior existence to which death only gave birth; restless, because the inexorable voice of conscience informed them that a great Being existed, Whom they, in some one way or another, must propitiate. But the futility of the attempts of the Grecian philosophers to construct an intellectual tower of Babel that should reach the heaven of God, is shown by their systems becoming confounded by the confusion of conflicting opinions and theories, till, like to those who built the tower on Shinar's Plain, the memory of their folly alone remains, but the religious systems founded on their wisdom have perished, and perished for ever. The whole story of the building of the tower of Babel may be read as a parable of the wisdom of the Greeks, with this different moral attached: in the one case the Lord descended in wrath to scatter His enemies; in the

other, God in compassion came down as Man to men, to gather them out of all kindreds, peoples, and tongues into one kingdom in Christ crucified. God-knowledge was to come, not from man to man, but from God to man.

No matter how exalted the intellectual capacities of men may be, they cannot by intellectuality discover God as He intends Himself to be known. They cannot find Him out as they can discover a law of nature, although they may know that where a law operates, a Lawgiver must exist. They cannot demonstrate His existence from a cross-examination of their own consciousness; yet, deducing from the law of continuity, they can infer a future life following the temporal one, and that continued life becoming contemporaneous with the eternal lifetime of God. They cannot analyse the nature of God's subsistence as they can resolve a mathematical problem; yet they know, should He for a moment cease to subsist, in that moment the universal all-things must vanish into void; for all things do only subsist by the Word of His power. But, however the abstract contemplation of the magnitude of His power may astound the mind and sublime the imagination, it can never thrill with sympathy the heart, nor console with hope the spirit of man,—that divine part which it is God's purpose to reconcile to Himself by the preaching of Christ crucified, and to purify and eternalize in the Fountain of Divine Love. The Greeks only read His First Volume, the Book of Nature, which treats of the majesty of His Power, and they were astounded and confounded; but we who read His Second Volume, the Book of Revelation, are delighted and consoled, for it treats of the majesty of His Love.

Fifty-two years after the birth of Christ St. Paul actually discovered in that city of wisdom, Athens,—Athens, the throne of wisdom-worship, whose schoolmen were teachers of wisdom in every city of any consequence—AN ALTAR DEDICATED TO THE UNKNOWN GOD; and whether we accept the legendary account of that altar's origin or not, the argument stands unaffected. Yes, after Athenian sages had for centuries been striving to search out the Almighty, they discovered—what? That God was unknown. God unknown! was the public declaration of the keenest intellects and most eloquent tongues that ever thought and ever spoke. God unknown! was the disconsolate, heart-breaking result of centuries of search—God acknowledged *to be*, acknowledged, but *unknown*. Here were a people of whom it may be said, notwithstanding all their subtle depths of wisdom and their soaring heights of imagination, that they were destitute of immortal knowledge, and without God in the world.

BUT WE PREACH CHRIST CRUCIFIED.—And is it surprising that we should preach Christ crucified—we who have the accumulated evidence of the failure of every religious system of man's devising to bring men to the knowledge of God? Innumerable religious systems have been constructed by the power of human wisdom, but they have fallen beneath the superior prowess of Time. A few that still survive serve but as dark foils to heighten by contrast the living lustre of that religion imparted by supernatural revelation, and to be maintained by supernatural agency.

The inhabitants of Corinth, to whom St. Paul wrote the words of our text, were equally celebrated with the Athenians for the enticing philosophies of man's wisdom, or shall I not rather say of man's folly? Not altogether in their motive cause, perhaps, man's folly; for the insatiable thirst for the knowledge of God and the intense feeling after Him in those pre-Christian Greeks, were undoubtedly of the operation of the Holy Spirit in their minds. Even in their ignorance their willing-mindedness was acceptable to Him, Who thereby prepared their hearts for the glad reception of the truth of God as revealed by the Beloved Son of the Father. Yet, after all, the wisdom of man is folly with God; and because Grecian philosophy had no divine stability, the Greeks, as time rolled on, adulterated the purer wisdom of their antiquity with so much sophistry, that it resulted in an almost worthless amalgam of meretricious wit. And although St. Paul made many faithful converts amongst the Corinthian Greeks, yet some, professing conversion, strove to graft their sinuous, false philosophies upon the noble simplicity of the Gospel—that tree of the Lord's right hand planting—and to foster a kind of fungus growth, which, had it flourished, would ultimately have ruined the tree itself. Therefore, to these Roman quasi-Corinthian Greeks the Apostle emphatically declared, "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Christ crucified to the Greeks was foolishness. Why? Because they were wise in their own degenerate wisdom, conceited of their self-knowledge, and bewitched of their systems of sophisticated morality. The maxims of the Gospel were opposed to the habits of their daily lives, and to the yearnings of their unregenerate hearts for unbridled free will in wickedness. The practice of their pleasant vices had rendered their hearts cold and callous to the celestial charms of the Christian charities, and the Divine Charity of charities—Christ crucified for sinners—they contemned as foolishness. They could admire the idea of a man laying down his life for his friend, as Damon for Pythias, but they only despised the Man Who laid down His life for His enemies. To their gods, they said, "revenge was a sweet morsel." How otherwise then than foolishness could appear to them that wisdom of God which made Christ crucified the power of God unto salvation, even to them who by wicked works

were at enmity with God? Incomprehensible to them was that "foolishness of God" which "is wiser than men," "that weakness of God" which "is stronger than men," because incomprehensible to them was the self-denying majesty of Divine, forgiving Love. In their eyes the power and wisdom of God were as foolishness, and their own foolishness was as wisdom. St. Paul, speaking to them of the wisdom of God, said that none of the princes of this world knew it, for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory.

As necessary as it was for the Apostle Paul to preach Christ crucified to Jews and Greeks, to sign-lovers and wisdom-seekers, so necessary is it that we should preach Christ crucified to the typical Jews and Greeks of our own day. Representatives of the Jews, Pharisees and Sadducees, we have to-day in our high formalists, and in our formal religionists, who, the one, either from perversity of ignorance, or through a perverted understanding and inverted imagination, would have God demonstrate Himself in material signs and lying wonders; who, the other, troubles himself not at all about a God-demonstration, but, in respectable callousness of custom, goes through the routine of religious ceremony and outward service, with a lackadaisical conscience and a lymphatic heart. The high formalist, and the formal religionist, are modern types of the old Jewish Pharisee and Sadducee. The spiritual idolatry of the high formalist, and the spiritual infidelity of the formal religionist, are their stumbling-blocks. Representatives contemporary, too, have we of the old Greek wisdom-seekers in our modern philosophers, who, in the self-satisfied smartness of theorising through the maze of their own mental convolutions, think they have analysed, not the UNKNOWN GOD, but what they term the GREAT UNKNOWABLE, and resolved His essence into mere Force, Whose essence by His own Divine definition is—Love. These theorisers are constantly constructing new systems of human wisdom upon the ruins of, and frequently also with the materials of, the old systems; ever building on the same shifting sands of Time, while the waves of eternal truth are as fast and for ever washing their structures away. The modern philosophers' subtle-woven theories of specious wisdom are their spiritual foolishness. But, to revert to a former figure of speech employed in this discourse, the power of God shall use the hand of Time as an instrument to level their wisdom-Babels with the dust, till nothing but the memory of their folly remains as a warning to future generations.

"BUT UNTO THEM WHICH ARE CALLED, BOTH JEWS AND GREEKS, CHRIST THE POWER OF GOD, AND THE WISDOM OF GOD." Inspiration's self here answers the question upon which this discourse is based—Can God be known by human wisdom? No! But He can be known by the knowledge of Christ crucified, Who is the power of God and the wisdom of God to them which are called—to *all* men, in the single sense of all men being called, and in the double sense to all them who, being called, heed their Saviour's invitation, "Come unto Me." Can God, then, be known by human wisdom? The Apostle's explanation clears up that question: "For after that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."

THE DIVINE PATERNITY.

BY THE REV. W. J. HOCKING, CURATE OF ST. PETER'S, HORNSEY, N.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. NICHOLAS-COLE-ABBEY LONDON, ON SUNDAY, JUNE 15TH, 1890.

"When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven."—LUKE xi. 2.

THE instinct of prayer in man is universal. It is the child, not of religion in its organised forms, not of priestcraft, not of tuition, but of man's conscious dependence upon the Absolute. It is the cry of human weakness seeking strength; the cry of spirits in darkness seeking light; the leaning of the finite upon the Infinite; the lesser going out to the Greater; human need appealing to the Invisible for help. To be a man is to be a pray-er; to live is to supplicate; to be is to be in the attitude of prayer. From such a text as this I might point out to you what are the elements of true prayer, what is its office, what its resultant effects, what it does for the pray-er and the prayed for. I might show you in what sense its efficacy is limited; how it is bounded by certain fixed and inviolable laws,—by the elements of expediency and impartiality, and by the unchangeable character of God. For in all our supplications to heaven, our petitions for help, our cries for deliverance, we must remember this, that no words of ours can alter the Divine law, the Divine disposition, or the Divine will. The operant power of prayer is not on the Object but on the subject; it lifts the human up to the Divine rather than brings the Divine down to human conceptions of the fitness of things. We must remember that the true province of prayer is not to make God's heart tender, or God's hand willing to bestow, but to make human hearts fit to receive and human minds ready to bow to the Divine will.

But my object in taking this text is rather to point out to you the conception that the Christ teaches us to entertain of God when we approach Him in the language, attitude, and spirit of prayer. Our Divine Teacher not only tells us what petitions to take to the throne of the Majesty of Heaven, but how to address the Deity, how to regard the Person to whom we pray. He reveals to us the relationship that

exists between the suppliant and the Dispenser, between the pray-er and the object of prayer. He bids us address the Divine, not in terms of flattery as suppliant slaves approaching their owner, not as criminals suing a judge, not as debtors appealing to a creditor, but as children to a parent. To the soul seeking help, crying for light, longing to be guided, asking to be delivered, pleading for pardon, feeling its dependence, dreading its own infirmities, God is to be—not Creator, not Judge, not Governor, not King—but *Father!* That word at once bridges the infinite gulf between heaven and earth, between the Eternal and the mortal, between the Divine and the human; and man with all his frailties, his ignorance, his sins, his needs, his desires, his hopes, his fears, as he breathes the word is in the presence of God, with a Father's hand upon his head and a Father's ear open to his prayers. Almost awful in its significance is the term, *Our Father!* Simple, beautiful, childlike, it is yet overpowering in its grand sublimity. It means that *I*, the weak, the erring, the sinful; I, the child of yesterday, falling into the gulf of to-morrow; I, a creature perishing with the moth, getting out of the cradle to step into the grave, and between cradle and grave groping in thick darkness and scarcely learning to lisp the names of the infinite wonders of creation—I may mount the steps of the throne, and, looking up into the face of the Eternal—ay, putting my hand right into the hand of God, may say, *Our Father!* That is the privilege of every soul that seeks God. "When ye pray, say 'Our Father!'" That is not only the revelation of Jesus, but the injunction of Jesus. But is it a fact, or is it fiction? Is it a comforting expression, or an eternal reality? Is it a preface to the suppliant's prayer, added to give him hope and courage, or is it the assertion of a truth which cannot be gainsayed? If Jesus the Christ spoke with authority, then it is the latter; if His words carry with them the very truth of God, then His Father is "our Father," then the Infinite and the Eternal is the Father of my spirit and the God of my life.

It was His work on earth to reveal God in this character. He was not the first to give the name of Father to the Deity. The idea—in germ form—is to be found in many of the writings of the Old Testament. The sweet singers of Israel sometimes rose very near to the conception of the paternity of God: "It is He that hath made us and not we ourselves; we are His people and the sheep of His pasture," is a near approach to the truth taught by Jesus. Once, indeed, the very name occurs, "Though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not, doubtless Thou art *our Father.*" But if we study the Old Testament as a whole we shall find that it was rather a name than a fact that was in the mind of the writer. Even the religious systems and philosophies of the heathen came near to recognising the truth. The purest and best of their deities they named "the father of gods and men." But we must come to Jesus Christ for a revelation of the fact of the Divine Paternity. With Him "Father" was more than a name, more than a sentiment, more than a shadowy conception floating in fitful lights through the galleries of the mind. The word "Father" called up an ever-present reality. Taking the word in its human sense, He applied it to set forth the closeness of the relationship, the unity of interest, the intimacy of communion that may exist between the Eternal God and His creature man. To Him it was a fact that all men are the offspring of God, and He taught that man, being God's offspring, may not only claim his relationship, but all the privileges that accrue from sonship and heirship. He taught the world not only to call God "Father," but to treat Him, look to Him, wait upon Him, pray to Him as such. Yea; He bids us ask the Father to give the children their daily bread. Surely that brings God down to the hearths of humanity; takes Him out of the far-distant heavens, and gives Him habitation in human dwelling-places; makes Him interested, not only in angel-anthems and heavenly choirs and celestial ministries, but in the spreading of the table for the children's food, in the unuttered prayer of the weak and the weary, in the joyous song of the soul that has been satisfied with the plenteousness of His bounty. It brings Him near to take the hand of the little child, stumbling in its first effort to walk, and to say to the old pilgrim on the journey, "Lean hard till we reach home!"

This, then, is a fact that we must remember in our approaches to the heavenly throne—we pray to "our Father." How ought it to affect our petitions? How direct the speech of our prayers?

And first I think it should assure us of *the Divine attentiveness to our prayers.* If the Eternal God be, in the sense taught by Jesus Christ, the Father of men; if he be, not only the great First Cause of all created things, but the sire of every human soul, the source of our being, the author of our life, then His offspring have a right to approach Him in the form, language and attitude of prayer. And to me, apart from the revelation of Jesus Christ, there is abundant evidence of the fact of the Divine Paternity; every human soul bears the marks of its Divine origin, is stamped with the lineaments of its Father. Human life is instinct with God; the human heart turns to heaven as to its home. Man—the thinking, feeling, fearing, hoping, loving, aspiring man, is begotten not of the blind and fortuitous forces that seem to govern the realm of mere animal life; he is the offspring of Deity, and ever and anon awakes to the consciousness of his Sonship. We cannot get away from the fact that we are God's. This consciousness—as well as the revelation of Jesus Christ—gives us right of access to the Divine Presence; the right of appealing to our Father's care. To call God Father, and then to doubt that He is interested in

us enough to hear us when we pray is to turn the fact into a fiction. God cannot forget the obligations that arise out of His relationship with humanity. A father cannot get away from the claims that his children have upon him by virtue of their being children. A man can choose not to be a father; he can will and determine not to have offspring; but the moment he is, by his own will and choice, the author of a life, he is bound to fulfil the obligations that arise out of his relationship with that life. The very instincts of nature teach us to fulfil the duties that are incumbent on us as fathers. And if God be our Father He is in precisely the same position. He could choose or refuse to bestow His life on humanity; it was of His own will that He begat children. We are His offspring as the result of His own deliberate choice and purpose. He is, therefore, bound to recognise His children's claims; bound to fulfil the duties arising out of His paternal character. Can we conceive of a father who would give no attention to his children's prayer? a father who would put himself in such a position that it would be impossible for his children's wants and wishes to reach him? If this be so in the human, compassed as we are with infirmities, and ignorance, and selfishness, and sin, how much more will it be in the Divine! I do not say that God is bound to give us what we ask, but, so far as the Divine may be interpreted by the human, He is bound to receive our prayers, bound to listen to the cry of those who call upon Him. I say again that to deny this is to undo the fact of His Fatherhood. The name "Father" is meaningless—nay, worse—illusive, misleading, and a mockery, unless the Divine Source and Author of life be in such a position as to be both able and willing to hear and consider the petition of the creatures His hands have made. I think, therefore, we may assure ourselves that every word of true prayer, every cry for help, every sob of penitence, every tear of sorrow, every wish of the soul is heard, seen, and understood in heaven. I believe, too, that we may assure ourselves not only of a hearing but sympathy; that our wants and weaknesses, our hopes and fears, will be regarded not from the standpoint of a dispenser, a philanthropist, a friend, but from that of parental love. And so, nothing that is of interest to us can be void of interest to God; nothing that affects us can be beyond the notice of "Our Father." Our whole life may thus be lived as in His presence, and all its varied circumstances may be taken to Him as to one ever pleased to hear His children's call. Wholly in keeping with the Divine Fatherhood is this thought—

> "There is no place where earth's sorrows
> Are more felt than up in heaven:
> There is no place where earth's failings
> Have such kindly judgment given."

And now let us consider how far this fact *warrants our expecting answers to prayer.* If God be in very truth "our Father," may we not expect that He will give His children the things which they ask for? My answer to that is, No! unhesitatingly No! God's best gifts do not come as answers to prayer; they come as the result of His forethought and provision for us. Hence it is that whether we pray or not, we have food and raiment, and light and warmth, and all the things necessary to our existence as animals. In the household of God there is provision for all the children; and when men want and starve the fault is not in God's domestic economy, but in the negligence, or idleness, or blundering, or wickedness of those to whom he has entrusted the working of the economy. How far, then, are we warranted in asking of God? I have already spoken of the laws that limit the efficacy of prayer. You will readily see, too, that where petitions are not bounded by these laws it may be more in keeping with the paternal character and disposition of God to withhold than to give. Where would domestic life be if a parent were to say to his children: "I have unlimited wealth, unlimited resources, and you may have anything you fancy provided you ask for it in a becoming manner?" Most of the children would be dead in a month. In their ignorance, or selfishness, or greed, they would ask for things that would make them so many suicides. Your child might take a violent fancy to your razor, and pray you, coax you, entreat you to give it him. How would you best display your love for that child, by giving it or withholding it? A revolver, charged in every compartment, might be an acceptable plaything, but no prayer in the world would incline a judicious father to give it to a suppliant child.

My brethren, in our approaches to the Infinite throne we are only children, most of us the merest babies, crying for things the nature of which we are not even able to grasp. Doubtless we often ask God for razors and revolvers and things that would be to us instruments of death, or pain, or disappointment. The Divine love is, therefore, more manifest in withholding than in giving. And we are warranted in expecting that God will give us, not what we ask, but what we need; not what we wish, but that which will be best for us. Parental love is best shown, not by granting every wish, but by supplying every need, by considering the ultimate good rather than the present and passing desire. And if God does not give us that which we wish when we pray He doubtless will give us what is better, the discernment of the futility of the thing we prayed for, and the satisfaction of knowing that we are better without it than with it.

And thus this preface of our prayers should be to us a grand moral lesson. It should interpret to us some of the enigmas of life; it should be as a bright star shining down upon the path of human pilgrimage. Shall we not, therefore, say: "*Our*

Father!" if the past was of Thy doing, then all was right—right then, right now. The birth that made us wonder where the bread was to be found, and the death that made us ask why Thou filledst our cup of joy to dash it down before we could drink; the glad wedding bells that changed into a funeral toll; the stress, the fury, the torment of conflicts that we did not expect and that we were not prepared to encounter—all right. We prayed Thee, with strong praying and tears, to spare our darlings; but Thou took'st them while the prayer was yet warm on our lips and the tears were still pleading that they might remain; and we have learnt to say: "He doeth all things well." We had so planned life that every path was to be flower strewn and every outlook to be upon blue mountains and laughing valleys. We asked continually that Thou wouldest let us live within the sound of music and to know nothing of darkness, or storm, or trouble. Thou didst lead us forth into the wilderness, where was ice, and briars, and storm, and conflict—every outlook was into the dark, every sound that reached us was of sorrow and sighing, and every step took us into intricate paths and rocky fortresses. But it was right. If Thou didst bite us with the gnawing tooth of hunger, it was that we might cry out for the living bread; and if Thou didst enclose us in the wilderness too large for a home, too bleak for summer flowers and autumn fruits, it was that we might seek the better country, and with quickened speed press on to the Father's House, which is the Children's Home. Our Father, Thy will be done, only in Thy leadings lead us home, and in the night of weariness and pain, and sorrow and disappointment, may every path we take lead us to the morning, and to Heaven, and to Thee. Amen!

THE *Church Times* has authority for stating that the Deanery of Manchester has been offered to Archdeacon Farrar. The Archdeacon has not yet decided whether to accept or decline the offer, and friendly pressure is being put on him to induce him to stay in London.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1890.

A YEAR WITH THE GERMAN REEDS.—II.

OUR year begins on Lady Day, 1889, and the three months since its expiration will be included in our period, ranking as days of grace for the current event, "Carnival Time." On that day we had accepted the invitation of some friends to accompany them to St. George's Hall, though it was at our own recommendation that they decided to go there instead of to a theatre, as we were all in favour of early hours and early suppers. As the call-bell rang, our friends admired the rural landscape painted on the curtain, which certainly is a work of art. The scenes, too, of which there is but one to each piece, are very tasteful and well set up. Mr. George Gear on his Erard, and his coadjutor on the harmonium, now struck up the overture, the "orchestra" being confined to these two instruments. In "The Bosun's Mate" the author, Mr. Walter Browne, who himself played the old Smuggler, showed that he had fully succeeded in adapting the parts to the players. Mr. Ernest Laris sang his two songs with a rich and powerful intonation, eliciting an encore. Certainly he was not such an *actor* as Mr. Duncan Young, who took his place subsequently; but he was fully equal to his part. There were some pretty passages between the two ladies, such as that where Winnie (Miss Kate Tully) asks Dolly(Miss Fanny Holland), "Do you *really* think I am in love?" which is answered by "You have all the recognised symptoms." Not only here, but in the other pieces, they played together most effectively. Now, we have Miss Tully as the daughter of the house, like Phyllis: "Sometimes forward, sometimes coy," with Miss Holland supervising her as the prim and

artful Dowager who aims at securing the portly Squire. Or again, it may be as two girl friends, whose lovers get *mixed.* Next in order of the "First Pieces" during our year came "Brittany Folk." Peasant life among the Bretons was charmingly portrayed, the girls' costumes being particularly good. The glowing fire over which Tonyk sat brooding was realistic in the old chimney-corner, and the Market Place and dance took us back to our own pleasant sojourn in the land where Tom Kingsbench spent such a delightful vacation, with *soup ad lib.* In the weird, out of the common style of music Mr. Alfred Caldicott was singularly happy, and he also deserves much praise for his bright and effective setting of "The Bosun's Mate." Next followed "Tuppins and Co.," the best parts being decidedly those of Miss Holland and Mr. Reed, the former giving her "Bong Tong" in grand form, followed by vociferous applause. This piece was taken on tour, and Mr. Edward Solomon's music was so popular that the London Music Publishing Company were induced to purchase and bring out the score. After a long run it gave place to "The Verger," whose idiosyncrasies were indicated by his name, "Simon *Beere.*" By his disgust at a party of visitors: "Um! They're a nice lot, they are! From the top of the tower to the bottom of the crypt for a threepenny bit!" By his inquiry whether, "A Dook's bigger than a Dean, ain't he?" And by his oft-repeated soliloquy: "Millions of money, and millions of acres!" We must now turn to Mr. Corney Grain's "Sketches," and the place they occupy in the entertainment. They always come last in order; but are very far from being least in importance. Many persons come exclusively to hear them. Mr. Grain has proved a valuable successor to the lamented John Parry, though his humour flows in quite a different channel. He cuts and slashes vigorously at all kinds of snobbery in both high and low life. He would, we feel sure, be the last to agree with those who—having little or no acquaintance with the earlier part of the entertainment—are wont to say that "the German Reeds are frumpy, Corney Grain is the life and soul of the whole thing." *They* may have "gone insane with Corney Grain upon the brain," but certainly *he* has not. That he takes an active interest in the "First Pieces" has just been proved by the melodious music he has written for "Carnival Time." The "Sketches" he has provided during our year are named: "John Bull Abroad," "A Day's Sport," "I've taken a House," "My Aunt's in town," "A Family Party," "Tommy at College," and that now current. As specimens we take "John Bull" and "Tommy." In the former, Henry Robert Brown is taken to the Continent and "whirled round and round" until obliged to confess that:—

> "I really can't enumerate the sights that I have seen;
> In fact I don't know what I've done, and I can't say
> where I've been."

He also meets the "British Mamma," who, as the train speeds on, keeps nudging her daughter, with "Alus! Look at that waterfall." At length she goes to a species of Madame Tussauds', and seeing him standing quite still, says to her attendant progeny, "Look! There's Kornee Grine!" When she gets close enough for inspection of the presumptive wax figure, he cannot resist the temptation, and throws up his hands with a yell. "Augh!" Collapse of British Mamma! If the large class of undergraduates who are typified in "Tommy at College" would take the advice given as to a "fiver for fun," their purses and their morals would be the gainers. A run from the "Bulldogs" and a freshman's *spread* with its "temples of barley sugar" and "fifteen chops frizzling in the fender" are splendidly taken off; and we think, "Sing, Tommy the Freshman, Oh!" and "The Slavey's Song," ought to have been given to the public. We have now reached the current pieces, both of which will be taken on tour during August and September. The adventures of Mr. Benjamin Braid, "the fifteen shilling trousers maker," and his wilful coquettish ward, Joyce Somers, during Carnival Time, are full of drollery, and sustain the interest throughout. Joyce is alarmed at the formal "Dear Miss Somers" of her guardian's letter, and on his arrival tells him that though, as he says, young people can't live on love, yet they can't exist without it, and so she means to marry her Charlie. Braid urges her to throw him over for a "Nob," the scion of a noble house whom he favours, Don Pepito, being well snubbed in consequence. In the inevitable, but troublesome chaperon, Dona Carmen, Mr. Braid finds his match, who is very anxious to *catch* him. A novel feature is the change of costume. Mr. Mackay changes from Pepito to the Waiter, in which part he is capital. Miss Fanny Holland is transformed from "Mrs. Carrotty Cosy" to the Gitana, and her impersonation is excellent, there being plenty of scope for the display of her skill in dancing, at which she was always very clever. Her get-up is superb. Miss Tully sings with her usual sweetness, and acts the part of Joyce prettily and playfully. The new tenor, Mr. Avalon Collard, has a pleasing voice, if not so powerful as that of Mr. Laris. But the real "go" of the piece is in Mr. Braid's part, and Mr. Reed was never more at home than when showing off the awkward blunders of this "retired gentleman." Braid's attempts to cover these are highly ingenious, for instance when he slides from "Customers" into "Custom House officers," and from "A pair of bags" into "*Two* bags I mean, you know. This one, and the other on board the Pantechnicon." His broken French and the sharp eye he keeps on his bag are very funny. The author, Mr. Malcolm Watson, has certainly adapted his piece to both performers and audience in a very creditable manner, while those who are in the

habit (a very good one, by the way) of frequenting this entertainment, will understand that the subject of "Carnival Time" must be congenial to Mr. Corney Grain, since he is particularly fond of describing foreign and Continental trips, deeming his stay at Cairo the pleasantest holiday he ever had. His music is very tuneful, and we do not see why he should not try his hand at a different style to those musical conventionalisms of the day which he mimics so well. "When night her heavy mantle," and "I'm a Gitana, merry and gay," are perhaps the best numbers. The music of the "Society Peep-show" is not so striking as that of some sketches we have heard, but the dialogue is very amusing, and slaps the Society papers hard. "The greed of gossip has grown, and grown, and grown." Society is not in or out of town for five weeks, but *passing through*, and crossing the Channel "ad nauseam." Then the female gamblers at Monte Carlo are shown up, and a good story told about an Englishman who dropped in a five-franc piece, and declared, "Si on me toucherai, je le *tooerai!*" A good parody is "Ten little Louis D'Ors." Next the *bathers* come in for their share, and give vent to their feelings thus: "Oh, for that far distant shore, Oh, for that land far away! Where no one need dress any more, And there's never a bill to pay." Then the young folks chime in with "For Grandmamma's sixty to-morrow, and she's to be Queen of the May." The entertainment closes on July 19th, and we believe that those of our readers who reside in or near those provincial towns where the German Reeds appear during the two following months will thank us for calling their attention to the treat in store for them.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." July, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Out of six papers, every one of which is full of interest, two stand forth especially interesting. One is Professor Ramsay's answer to Canon Hicks' paper last month on the "Riot in the Theatre at Ephesus." The Professor does not accept many of Canon Hicks' conclusions. He does not think the riot was a got-up affair, but a sudden outburst of artizan indignation. It seems to us that St. Luke's narrative is capable of either interpretaion. Professor Ramsay may be right, but we can see no "contradiction" between the Apostolic narrative and Canon Hicks' theory. The difficulty about no shrines having been found, which the latter writer raised, we think Professor Ramsay has clearly accounted for; being silver, they quickly found their way back into the melting-pot.

The other paper is one by Professor Marshall, entitled "Did St. Paul use a Semitic Gospel?" We cannot say he has convinced us, for two preliminary and insuperable difficulties—that no such document is ever directly quoted either by Apostle or Father, and that so important a document would surely have been preserved—he never faces. But he really does bring forward arguments more than merely plausible for his contention. He examines three out of the six cases of coincidence between the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, and does, we think, show that they are "capable of explanation on the hypothesis that they give a variant translation of a common original." A lawyer would tell him he must prove more than that to establish his case. One is the coincidence between 1 Thess. v. 6 and St. Luke xxi. 35, where St. Paul has ὥσπερ ἡ ὠδὶν and St. Luke has ὡς παγίς. Now if חבל were the word in the assumed Semitic original it has both meanings, and St. Luke may have used one and St. Paul the other. So again צידה means both "hire" (St. Luke x. 7), and "food" (S. Matt. x. 10), and St. Paul quotes the passage in 1 Tim. v. 18. And the Professor's explanation of the variation between St. Luke xxii. 19 and 1 Cor. xi. 24 is still more striking and ingenious, but is too long to quote.

Professor J. A. Beet's examination of passages in the Fourth Gospel bearing on the subject of Future Punishment is able and temperate. Professor Cheyne writes in his better manner on the Sixty-Third Psalm. Professor Milligan continues his papers on the "Resurrection of the Dead." We note his translation of verse 42; not, It is sown, etc., but, There is a sowing in corruption, etc.; but feel very dubious. We agree with what he says about the impossibility of finding any word which properly translates ψυχικός; why did not the Revisers paraphrase, If there is a body adapted to earthly life, there is also a body adapted to spiritual life.

We have received the June number of "The Messenger, a Monthly Expositor of the Prophecies concerning Israel in Britain." We are not, however, aware of any such prophecies.

We have also received "Ignation Difficulties and Historic Doubts," by Rev. R. C. Jenkins. The author attempts in 25 pp. of very large print to upset Bishop Lightfoot's three weighty volumes.

Also a placard, called "The Contrast, the Catholic Church, and the Papacy."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

EVOLUTION.

Sir,—In saying, "Mr. Evans' last letter proves the truth of my statement that it is well-nigh impossible to convince an anti-Evolutionist," Mr. Henslow has omitted to add the words "*on insufficient evidence.*"

2. Mr. Henslow mentions some instances of what he calls "perfectly fertile hybrids." I observe that they are all taken from the *vegetable* kingdom. As the beautifully simple theory of evolution (if it explains anything) obviously has to explain *everything*, would it not have been more to the point to produce some examples from the animal kingdom, to which we ourselves belong? M. de Quatrefages (an authority quoted by Darwin himself) shall reply to Mr. Henslow. This distinguished scientific writer (who is *Membre de*

l'Institut and Foreign Member of the Royal Society) says, "*Hybrid plants have never produced hybrid races.*" And, "I have already replied to the arguments drawn from the fertility of certain hybrids by showing to what it is reduced. *Writers who insist upon this point invariably forget the lesson taught us by disordered variation and reversion without atavism.* I regret being obliged to place among them Darwin, who, in his later writings, has shown much less reserve than in his earlier publications." I commend to Mr. Henslow's notice the words I have italicised. M. De Quatrefages also observes: "The characters of hybrids are—infertility as a general rule, and, in the exceptions, a very limited fertility; series suddenly cut short either by infertility, by disordered variation, or by reversion without atavism."

3. With regard to the definition of "species" it is quite possible that some errors may have been made in the hitherto received classification of plants and animals. Creatures, which, in reality, are only varieties of the same species, have perhaps sometimes been too hastily supposed to belong to different species. I doubt, however, if Darwin or anyone else will be able to add much to the statement of that ancient writer (the only writer who has ever given mankind a rational account of their own origin), who says, that each creature was produced "after its kind" (Gen. i. 24). By interpreting this word "kind" in the light of that interesting, important, and impressive scientific fact (the sterility of hybrids), of which M. De Quatrefages has just assured us above, we shall, I expect, arrive at as good a definition of "species" as we are ever likely to obtain.

4. Mr. Henslow says: "Both existing apes and man have descended from a common ancestor, which was neither ape nor man. The letter Y will represent the differentiations. . . . No trace of the creature has ever been found." There I cordially agree with Mr. Henslow. Not only has no trace of the creature ever been found, but no trace of the creature ever will be found, except in the heated brains of perfervid scientists. I venture to suggest the letter X as a far more appropriate symbol of such a wholly "unknown quantity" as "this creature" of Darwin's imagination.

5. Finally, Mr. Henslow observes: "There was a time when the present writer, as well as Mr. Evans himself, could only utter inarticulate sounds, perhaps not unlike those of their common, and yet undifferentiated hairy quadrumanous ancestor. Yet now they can even argue for and against evolution respectively!" But surely if Mr. Henslow's eyes were only enlightened he would see at once that (although not yet exercised) the great gifts of reason and speech were both implicitly there, and Mr. Henslow's advance in the scale of being has been in strict accordance with, or, rather, has been due to the simple unfolding of, that complex human nature originally ordained by the Divine Mind, and once for all bestowed by the Divine Hand—that his own sweet nursery cooings were more forcible arguments against evolution than any of his letters of later years could possibly be in favour of evolution. These inarticulate sounds proceeded from a (more or less) interesting little creature, who was not indebted to his environment for the evolution of his vocal chords, or for the extra size, weight, and sinuosity of his brain, which "differentiated" him so completely from his "hairy quadrumanous ancestor." They were all his (as they were all his earliest ancestor's) to begin with—a free and glorious gift.

No, sir, these pretentious and plausible theories won't do. How refreshing it is to escape from the bogs and fogs of "science falsely so-called," to turn away from the grotesque monstrosities of evolution, and to breathe for a moment the serene atmosphere of that true poet,

> "Who felt the charm of childhood, grace of youth,
> Grandeur of age, insisting to be sung;
> Whose impassioned argument was simple truth,
> Half wondering at its own melodious tongue."

For my part, I like to think of my infancy—not in connection with that imaginary "hairy quadrumanous ancestor" which Mr. Henslow declares to be "common" to ourselves and the baboons (which latter he takes infinite pains to prove are not our "greatest" grandfathers, only our cousins)—but according to the view of this great Poet of Nature and of man:

> "Our birth is but a sleep, and a forgetting;
> The soul that rises with us, our life's star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting,
> And cometh from afar.
>
> Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God who is our home;
> Heaven lies about us in our infancy.
> * * * *
> Earth, homely nurse, doth all she can
> To make her foster-child, her inmate man
> Forget the glories he hath known,
> And that imperial palace whence he came.
> * * * *
> Thou whose exterior semblance doth belie
> Thy soul's immensity;
> Thou best philosopher, who yet dost keep
> Thy heritage; thou eye among the blind,
> That, deaf and silent, read'st the eternal deep,
> Haunted for ever by the eternal mind,
> Mighty Prophet! Seer blest!
> On whom those truths do rest,
> Which we are toiling all our lives to find;
> Thou, over whom thy immortality
> Broods like the day, a master o'er a slave,
> A presence which is not to be put by;
> Thou little child, yet glorious in the might
> Of heaven-born freedom.
> * * * *
> Truths that wake
> To perish never;
> Which neither listlessness nor mad endeavour,
> Nor man nor boy,
> Nor all that is at enmity with joy,
> Can utterly abolish or destroy!
> Hence in a season of calm weather,
> Though inland far we be,
> Our souls have sight of that immortal sea
> Which brought us hither;
> Can in a moment travel thither,—
> And see the children sport upon the shore,
> And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore."

H. HEBER EVANS.

June 24th, 1890.

SIR,—I quoted, in a letter which you published, a letter of Sir John Herschel's, written before Darwin's name had become known, in which he expressed his belief that what is now called evolution is true. I shall not believe that he ever called it "the Law of Higgledy Piggledy," unless I see this quotation as well verified as mine. Sir John Herschel was a man of strong sense and some imaginative power, besides great knowledge of science, and I have no doubt he saw that the first chapter of Genesis is a philosophical poem. But to say that it contradicts evolution is as

absurd as to say that it contradicts the high antiquity of the earth.

Though I recognise Darwin's vast services to science, I do not think natural selection will explain everything in evolution, and I think he is not successful in his attempt to make it account for the cell-building instinct of the bee.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

July 5th, 1890.

WHO TAKES SCRIPTURE LITERALLY?

SIR,—The letter of Canon Crosthwaite in the PULPIT of the 5th contains three arguments or considerations on the nature of the sacrifice of the Eucharist. The first of these is not new, being a well-known argument against the Romish doctrine of a corporeal presence. Not that its being old and well known makes it conclusive or even sound. On the contrary, it proves too much and is utterly unsound. It is, that it is impossible for the words of consecration to create a change in the elements, because either they pronounce that the change has taken place or will take place. It is impossible, that is (so it is said) that the words of consecration can produce the change. Of course this must be admitted. The words cannot *produce* what nothing but Divine power could produce. But this does not hinder that the change (if there be any) in the elements may take place through Divine influence, in answer to and simultaneously with the prayer of consecration. Now apply this argument of Canon Crosthwaite to the true doctrine of the Presence in the Eucharist. It is impossible that the prayer of consecration should produce a Divine Presence in the Communion, because either there was that Presence before, or the Presence follows, the prayer. Let this be admitted ; the prayer cannot *produce* the presence. But the presence is given by Divine grace in answer to the prayer. So, I believe, and so, unless I err, nearly all Christians who accept the teaching of our Lord and of St. Paul believe. On or with the blessing of the cup and the breaking of the bread, the elements become, through the influence of Divine grace, the vehicle by which we receive the Blood and Body of the Lord. The argument that pretends to overturn the Romish notion of the corporeal presence, and that is susceptible, on the same grounds, of overturning the true doctrine of the Real Spiritual Presence, is not an argument that ought to be employed, or given any weight to, and besides the argument is vicious altogether.

The second consideration advanced by your correspondent on this subject purports to be in controversion of the dogma that the Communion is the "Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity," of our Lord. But he seems to me actually to pronounce, not against that assumption, but in its favour. "The bread," he says, "which we are to eat, is His Divinity, which alone came down from heaven. The whole literal meaning fails"—the literal meaning, as I understand, of a great part of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Certainly if Christ's Flesh, which He gave for the life of the world (v. 51), which Flesh (same verse) is the living bread which came down out of heaven, be Christ's Divinity, the literal meaning fails ; and if the eating of His Flesh and drinking of His Blood imparts eternal life (v. 54), while this Flesh and Blood are really of our Lord's Divine, and not of His human nature, the literal meaning fails. But this is an exposition of that wonderful chapter that I think every Protestant ought to refuse to accept ; and not only every Protestant, but every reasonable person who appreciates the teaching of St. Paul that the Communion is a sacrifice ; a representation of that sacrifice offered on the Cross once for all, by our Lord as the Son of Man.

I had occasion not long ago to make some remarks in a letter to the Editor of the PULPIT on the allegorical reading of the book of Jonah, objected to by another writer of letters. If "C. C., V.-G." is the same as Canon Crosthwaite, he reminds me of Lord Macaulay's account of the Quaker Fox, who, by interpreting figuratively great portions of the Bible that everyone else had supposed should be interpreted literally, and by interpreting literally other portions that everyone else interpreted figuratively, constructed a system of theology, very original, but extremely unreasonable.

The third observation in the letter of the 5th inst. is on a sermon by some Dublin Romanist, who, Canon Crosthwaite says, proves one piece of nousense by another more outrageous. Now transubstantiation is not exactly "nonsense ;" and the mathematical argument of the sermon in question, on ubiquity, is not nonsense at all, but perfectly reasonable, although not very well expressed in the extract. Its fault is not in itself, but in its want of relation to the true doctrine.

I more than question the usefulness of such letters as that on which I now remark. But if anyone can set forward old truth in new light, or new truth, or valuable suggestion, in any light, or can offer reasonable criticism, let such be welcome.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

WHAT IS TO BE ADORED?

SIR,—On the answer to this question hangs all that concerns light, incense, genuflections, and eastward position. What is to be adored ?

The Bennett case has now turned up. We are told in Ireland that the judgment in that case was not adverse to him, and that no one can now be condemned for holding the same that he did. Our *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* of May 9, 1890, in its zeal for Bennett, actually put into the mouths of his judges the very language which the sentence condemned as "rash, ill-judged, and perilously near to violation of the law." This misstatement, though challenged, has never been withdrawn or explained away. No doubt the judges did not condemn Mr. Bennett. But why ? Because, they said, his language might be taken in an ultra-Protestant sense, a sense which he would have scorned. He might mean, they said, only to adore "Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament." Now "Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament" may have two meanings—first, Christ present as Deity where two or three are met together in his name ; second, Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament may mean, as St. Paul has it : "The bread which we break, is it not the communication of His Body," or grace from His Body ? In either of these senses, Mr. Bennett's language would be innocent. Taken so, his words would have been allowable. But his words cannot be so taken. In the first and second editions of his "A Plea for Toleration," he had it that our Lord's Body is "visible" on our altars. In the same editions he also has it, "I adore the sacramental elements." These monstrous, and worse than Roman, statements,

he afterwards withdrew; but he declared at the same time that his opinions on the subject were unaltered. To suppose, then, as the judges did, that, by the presence, which he called "visible" and therefore corporal, he could mean either a mere presence of the Deity, or a presence of grace with the elements, this is beyond the bounds of charity. He meant a corporal presence of our Lord's Body natural, though not visible. Such a doctrine the judgment condemned, Mr. Bennett pretending no longer to assert it in error, though he held it in his heart. It is monstrous then for our Irish Church papers to tell us that no one can now be condemned for holding the same doctrine. A man who, in order to deny the Trinity, asserts the Unity of the Godhead, may escape through his judges, hoping that the Unity he asserts is compatible with Trinity. But that is not to be taken as a sanction of heterodox language.

I come then to my question, What is to be adored? The Deity; also our Lord's Body, present with His Divinity on the throne of heaven. On our altars there is nothing to be adored. Not the elements; not our Lord's material Body, which is confined to heaven alone. As it is a natural Body, it must be so confined. Resurrection may have refined it; but it is a natural Body still. Some indeed pretend, as an eminent prelate did lately, that it could not be bound by bars and bolts, or, he might have said, with equal plausibility by the rock tomb. But all this is mere romance—a resurrection body requires the tomb to be opened to give it exit, as was the case, when the bodies of the saints arose. It is astonishing how long people were misled by vicious interpretations of texts. How long did Romanists and Protestants humbug us by the notion that the bread from heaven of John vi. was our Lord's Body, though what came down from heaven was His Deity, and not His human Body? How long did they deceive people with the notion that "this is My Body," means this is my Body, Soul, and Divinity, whereas my Body, that is slain, speaks of a dead and not a living Body. How long did people believe that words, which assert a change as past, do, at the same time, produce that change? How long will people, contrary to their senses, believe a change, which makes void the testimony of the Apostles' senses, as to our Lord's miracles and resurrection? I believe, I know not what, is the state of some. I believe not, because it is impossible, is the creed of others.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Canon and V.-G. of Kildare.

AT a special ordination in the Palace Chapel at Llandaff on Sunday, Mr. Griffith Hartnell Jones, M.A., of Jesus College, Oxford, was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Llandaff, and afterwards licensed to the curacy of All Saints', Cardiff.

MISS E.A. BODEN, daughter of the late Rev. Edward Boden, head master of the Grammar School, Clitheroe, has been accepted by the committee of the Universities' Mission as a lady missioner in Central Africa, and will sail for Zanzibar in September.

IT is the intention of the Bishop of London to admit the chaplains in the north of Europe (*i.e.*, those who are not under the supervision of the Bishop of Gibraltar) to representation in the diocesan conference. The congregations of Northern Europe will probably be thrown into two groups—*quasi*-deaneries—each of which will be asked to return a certain number of lay and clerical representatives.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anderson, Rev. Andrew, Vicar of St. Mark's Dunham Massey, Vicar of Weaverham, Cheshire.
Baker, Rev. Henry Fowler, B.A., Rector of Great and Little Ryburgh, Fakenham.
Bindley, Rev. T. Herbert, M.A., Assistant-Curate of Ixworth, Principal of Codrington College, Barbados.
Carrick, Rev. Robert Mallabar, B.A., Rector of Castle Ashby, Northamptonshire.
Colman, Rev. Frederick Selincourt, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's, Earlsfield, Surrey.
Craster, Rev. T. H., Rector of Denton, Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lincolnshire, Sir W. E. Welby Gregory, Bart., of Denton Manor.
Davidson, Rev. J. S., M.A., Curate of Lastingham, York; Rector of Full Sutton, near York.
De Salis, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Milverton, Somerset; Rural Dean of the Wellington District, Somerset.
Dobree, Rev. Prebendary, Vicar of Goldenhill; Vicar of Colwich, Staffordshire.
Eagar, Rev. Alexander Richard, B.D., Curate of Budock; Vicar of Manaccan, Cornwall.
Exell, Rev. J. S., M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour's and Townstal, Dartmouth; Rector of Stokefleming, Devonshire.
Gallaher, Rev. Francis, of the Irish Society, Manchester; Licensed Preacher within the Diocese of Manchester.
Giblin, Rev. John Michael, M.A., Vicar of Good Easter, Essex.
Gill, Rev. T. Howard, M.A., Chaplain of the English Church, Paris; Vicar of Tonbridge, Kent.
Henderson, Rev. William Pollock, M.A., Vicar of Biggleswade.
Hendy, Rev. Francis Paul James, B.A., Rector of Cardynham, Cornwall.
Hird, Rev. H. G., M.A., Senior Curate of Halifax Parish Church; Surrogate for the Diocese of Wakefield.
Hughes, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Llanidloes; Chaplain to the Bishop of Bangor.
Hughes, Rev. W. Hawker, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Bangor.
Jerrom, Rev. H. J., Assistant Chaplain to the London Hospital.
Jones, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Ewenny, Bridgend; Vicar of Llangwm, near Usk.
Lambert, Rev. James Hiley, M.A., Rector of Pencombe; Vicar of Marston Stannett, by dispensation.
Lancaster, Rev. John James, Vicar of Inskip, Preston; Hon. Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Manchester.
Law, Rev. J. H. A., M.A., Vicar of Babraham and Vicar of Great Abington, Cambridge.
Lennard, Rev. Vivian Rodwell, M.A., Vicar of Astley, Warwickshire; Rector of South Hackney.
Maclure, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar of Rochdale; Archdeacon of Manchester.
Maud, Rev. J. Primatt, M.A., Vicar of Chapel-Allerton, Leeds.
Munn, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Wethersfield Lectureship.
Parry, Rev. Hugh, Rector of Alerton, Leicestershire.
Philpott, Rev. John Nigel, M.A., Rector of Stoke Albany-cum-Wilbarston, Northamptonshire.
Pollock, Rev. E. Downing, Rector of Kingsley, Cheadle, Staffordshire; Vicar of Tamworth.
Pryce, Ven. Archdeacon, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Bangor.
Puxley, Rev. Edward Lavallin, B.D., Rector of Kessingland, Suffolk.
Read, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Devonport; Rector of St. Stephen and St. Martin, Exeter.
Rolleston, Rev. Frederick Christopher Lawrence; Vicar of Great Dalby, Leicestershire.
Waller, Rev. E. A., M.A., Vicar of Great and Little Packington; Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Demain, Rev. Henry, M.A., many years resident in Hertford, at his residence, Elmfield, Ramsgate, on the 4th inst., aged 88 years.
Helmore, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Priest-in-Ordinary to H.M. Chapels Royal, at 72, St. George's Square, on the 6th inst., aged 79 years.
Hodges, Rev. John Julius, for thirteen years Curate and for forty-nine years Rector of Onibury, on the 24th ult., aged 84 years.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SPIRITUAL ELEMENT IN PREACHING.

By the Rev. A. J. F. BEHRENDS, D.D., Yale Lecturer.

Sermon Preached in a Course of Yale Lectures on Preaching.

IN defining spirituality as a fixed mental and moral habit, to be carefully distinguished from ecstasy or from emotional excitement, having its rational ground in the clear discernment of what God and man are in their essential nature and in their mutual relations, and its ethical quality in the voluntary and habitual subjection of the conscious and active life to the judgments which such discernment forms, I have propounded no theory of my own. I have simply given to the language of Scripture its natural force. Spirituality is, in the carefully-selected phraseology of Paul, *φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος* the mind of the spirit. The word *φρόνημα* has no exact English equivalent. It is not synonymous with *νοῦς*, the equivalent of our word-understanding or reason, the faculty of rational perception and judgment. Our nearest approach to such a use of the word "mind" as makes it reflect the meaning of *φρόνημα* is in the frequent popular saying, "I have a great mind to do this or that"—a phrase which not only expresses a rational sentiment, but also announces an intention. *φρόνημα* is derived from the root *φρήν*, which literally means "diaphragm," the muscle which separates the heart and the lungs from the lower viscera, and so it became descriptive of all the organs clustering around the heart, which together constitute the seat of physical life. By a natural transition it was carried up to describe the interior constitution of the invisible and conscious self, the sum total of the soul's rational, emotional, and volitional powers, the organ of grief, love, anger, and courage, of mental perception and thought, of will and purpose. It is the man in the centre of his personality, stripped of all that is seeming and accidental. The "mind" in you is what you are, in your thoughts, desires, and aims. Not all the thoughts which you have belong to your mind, but only such thoughts as are intensely vital, stirring your deepest emotions and impelling you to action. Not all that you feel belongs to your mind, but only such emotions as spring out of your thoughts and shape your conduct. Not everything that you do shows what your mind is, but only such actions as are the outcome of rational conviction and genuine love. The "mind" of a man is what he is, in the organic unity of his secret thoughts, affections, and aims. He has the mind of the flesh, if the gravitation of his inmost self is towards the things of the flesh, the things that minister to selfish ease and ambition, no matter how refined his pursuits and habits may be. The carnally-minded man is not necessarily a coarse man. He need not be a glutton, or a drunkard, or a debauchee. He may be a man of blameless reputation. But he is, everywhere and always, selfish, self-centred, and self-seeking, with his eye on the main chance, taking care of number one, an altruistic egoist if he gives any thought to his neighbour, counting nothing real which does not bring present and tangible advantage. And to be spiritually-minded is to have the thoughts, the desires, and the aims of the spirit, to survey and measure all things from the centre of the invisible and the eternal, judging yourself as God judges you, treating your fellow-men as God would have you treat them, estimating life as God estimates it, honouring God as He deserves to be honoured. A curious illustration of the vagueness which encompasses this important question of spirituality, the mental fog in which many preachers labour when they venture to give definite outline to their thought upon it, has just fallen under my eye in a report of an elaborate sermon, preached only a day or two since, by one of our city pastors. The concordance has been fully and faithfully used. There were Scriptural quotations in abundance, and these gave a decidedly evangelical flavour to the discourse. There was a certain rude logical order in the arrangement of the Biblical material, but it was purely verbal, and of a real analysis there was not the slightest trace. The only approach to a real discernment of the problem was in the hint now and then obtruded that spirituality was the reverse of ceremonialism in worship and conduct; and it was evident that such interjected phrases were little more than the mechanical repetition of current platitudes of speech, and that their real significance had not become clearly outlined to the preacher's mind. The sermon bore the marks of faithful painstaking work. The tone was modest and quiet; there was no attempt at rhetorical display; and it was evidently the work of an earnest and devout man; but it left the hearer just where it found him, with a mass of Biblical texts, not one of which had been compelled to yield its mighty secret. It was unutterably lifeless and dull, for the simple reason that it was unintelligible. It lacked definite mental perception, and, therefore, ended in mental cloudiness and confusion. Much was said about "being filled with the Spirit," but the phrase touched no living chord; it had a mystical ring, as descriptive of some strange, supernatural, or miraculous operation in which the soul is passive, and which defies explanation and expression. It

may seem to you a hard and narrow rule, but it is an eminently practical and salutary one for the preacher, as I believe it to be inexorably universal, that what is true is always intelligible; that revelation is unveiling, not mystification; and that the time of the sermon is worse than wasted unless the message is so phrased that every man can understand it. There is nothing shadowy or mystical in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and in the resultant spirituality of life. It is an intelligent and intelligible state. It is conscious and voluntary. The preacher to whom I have referred might have made his sermon luminous and searching by simply inquiring what ceremonialism in worship was. It is membership in the visible Church, observance of the Sabbath, subscription to a creed, a reverent posture in prayer, a decent behavour among men, the regular and reverent participation in ordinances. It is devotion to externals. It is contentment with forms. It is regard for appearances. In or out of the Church, that is Pharisaism, the mind of the flesh, giving no true liberty, and cursing the soul with drought and increasing impotence. It is living in the realm of the seen and the temporal. And what is the opposite of ceremonialism? It is the worship of God in spirit and truth, the converse which is the natural and habitual outcome of a clear knowledge of what God is and of what you are, the conscious and mutual exchange of thought between an erring, needy, penitent child and its Holy, Loving Father, who is in heaven. In or out of the Church, that is spirituality, the fixed habit of dealing with invisible and eternal realities. To be filled with the Spirit is simply to be under the dominance of those convictions which give reality to God and the soul, as the two sole factors by which the universe is constituted, and by which time and eternity are shaped. For when the heavens and the earth pass away, God remains and the soul abides. The reason and the will are the sphere of the Divine impact and indwelling; these are not mystical, but dynamic, and they are dynamic by illumination of the understanding and by securing voluntary obedience to this revelation. To be filled with the Spirit is the same thing as being guided by the Spirit into all truth; it is to see things as they really are, and to act in accordance with that vision. Spirituality, therefore, is a rational and voluntary state. It begins with mental sanity, piercing through all shams and deceptive appearances, to God as the Holy Father, and to man as His lost and wandering child. It is easy enough to repeat these phrases, but they are not real perceptions unless they become the fixed and habitual temper of your whole mental and moral life, the standard of universal rational judgment, and the living law of obedience. With every advance in the clearness of your apprehension of what God is and what man is, there must come, *pari passu*, the prompt and voluntary practical response. You must live as you think; you must be obedient to the heavenly vision; for God and the soul; fatherhood and sonship, are not figures of speech, the empty generalisations of the speculative understanding, but the only eternal realities in a universe of change.

I have spoken of spirituality as a fixed mental and moral habit, and habit involves careful and patient cultivation. I proceed, therefore, to speak of the methods by which this quality must be developed into healthy and vigorous maturity. Of these, the first place must be given to attention. If even the physical universe does not yield its secret to the inattentive and superficial observer, if the inspection must be repeated and discriminating, with the persistent use of microscope and telescope and the most delicate instruments, much more true is it that the invisible realities of divine and human being demand honest, patient, and prolonged attention. No physiological processes can give us so much as a glimpse of the soul, or cast any light upon its essential constitution. You might as well attempt to construct the science of anatomy by an analysis and synthesis of the deliverances of consciousness. The soul is an ultimate and invisible fact, the whole evidence of whose real existence is crystallised in the personal pronoun "I," and whose real nature can be understood only by the cross-examination which reflection employs. If psychology has been less rapid in its advance than the physical sciences, the reason is that the processes of psychological attention are more difficult and exhaustive than the process of sensuous observation. But he who deals with the souls of men must patiently face his own soul, and cannot be excused from giving continuous attention to what it has to say on its own behalf. Nor can there be any real conviction that there is a God, much less an adequate knowledge of what He is, except by profound and habitual attention to all the *media* through which His eternal Godhead is disclosed. The conviction is intuitive only in the sense that it is not foreign to the mind, intruded upon it from without, traditional or the refuge of mental impotence, the necessary choice between two inconceivables. It is intuitive because it is inevitable to him who reflects, and because repeated attention makes it only more irresistible to thought. It is not the precipitate of observation; it emerges in rational reflection.

I need hardly remind you that the elaborate ontological, cosmological, teleological, and historical arguments for the Divine existence are no longer regarded as invulnerable and conclusive. They assume what they prove; they do no more than trace the reflecting process by which the native and personal conviction justifies and interprets itself. No man climbs to the throne of God, by the pathway of the stars, who does not find the evidence of His existence and sovereignty first of all in himself. I do not mean that there is any God-consciousness in him, a barbarous transla-

tion of the German phrase, which strictly means only a native, rational, immediate conviction of the Divine existence. Consciousness is only of self; but a rational attention to what this consciousness of our personal, mental, and moral states discloses finds its root and synthesis only in the affirmation of the Divine existence and supremacy. The rational and the ethical, as we are conscious of them in ourselves, are uncreated and absolute in their quality; we cannot think of them as relative and limited; and our whole conscious life is thrown into endless and hopeless contradiction unless we postulate the existence and the sovereignty of Reason and Right in the uncreated and eternal personal God. The process is not one of speculation, but of definition by attention. Attention scatters the mists and reveals the uncreated glory. the eternal and sovereign reality.

In Biblical phrase, God reveals Himself to man through faith; to him whose attention is voluntary, sincere, and habitual. Here is our first duty—to meditate long and lovingly upon ourselves and upon Him whose image we bear, until God and the soul shall master us with their reality. You are already prepared for a second suggestion, that if you would be spiritually minded you must be men of prayer. For such attention as I have emphasized is itself the heart of prayer. The Socratic method is the spiritual method. It bristles with interrogation points. It is perpetually asking questions, seeking that it may find, knocking that doors may be opened. For while adoration and confession and thanksgiving are inseparable from true prayer, petition is its heart; and petition always subordinates its request to the Divine will, the demand softening into the inquiry what that will is, so that we may pray as we ought. There is a lower use of prayer in which many rest. They come to God only when they need something, when the guilt and shame of sin oppresses, when grief embitters life, when the spirit is overwhelmed with a sense of its weakness. The Lord is a strong refuge and a high tower, into which we run when our spears are broken and our shields trampled into dust. We think only of ourselves, and our speech is burdened with the enumeration of our wants. But it is far more important that God should have His way with us than that we should have our way with Him. For God knows us infinitely better than we know ourselves, and we shall ask most wisely when we let Him show us His mind. The twenty-third Psalm is the sweetest of all religious lyrics, because of its discovery that God is the Shepherd of the soul. That not only secures against want, it drives out the very thought of want, so that David has no request to make. The path is always luminous, the table is always a royal banquet, the way is always secure, and even the grave is within the enclosure of the Divine pasturage.

This is the higher use of prayer, in which we question God about what He is and what we are, setting our psalm of life to the key of His self-revelation. He who does that will be jubilant, not sad-toned; for all God's thoughts are a *Gloria in Excelsis*. It is the law of true politeness, when you are a guest, not to talk about yourself, unless your host leads the way and pursues the inquiry. You win his way by admiring his home, his grounds, his library, his pictures, by falling into his line of thought, and enriching yourself by his experience. The more renowned and successful the man whom you meet, the more anxious you are to let him tell his story to you. If I could have Paul as my guest a week, I would not use five minutes of the time to tell him what I thought, nor would I open Meyer or Godet once during the interview. I should do nothing but ask questions, and let him do the rest of the talking. I should be perpetually anxious to know his mind. And to know the mind of God—what He thinks, desires, and purposes, and what He is—is the highest function of prayer. You do not need to tell Him what you are, for He knows more than you do about that; let Him tell you what He is, and how He regards you, for you will never know either unless you sit silently and attentively at his feet. And this inquiring attitude must be habitual. It is well to pray morning, noon, and night; it is well to pray when you open your Bible and choose your text; it is well to pray with pen poised over the blank sheet; it is well to pray before you utter the first word of your message; but you may and must do more; docility must be ingrained—reverence must be habitual; prayer must be your native air. In the inmost strain of your intellectual activity there must be a receptive and inquiring temper which makes you eagerly responsive to anything which casts new light upon the character of Him in whom all live and move, and by whom all must be judged. So shall it not be you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father who dwelleth in you.

No mistake, however, could be more serious than to imagine that because spirituality is the fixed mental and moral habit of dealing with the invisible and eternal realities of God and the soul, matured through attention and prayer, it is therefore best promoted by contemplative devotion. Self-absorption, even when dealing with the thought of God, has its dangers. We may easily mistake our fancies for the suggestions of the Spirit, as the ignorant and untrained are perpetually tempted to do. The old slave population of the South were the professed recipients of many such revelations; but an honoured friend of mine, whose early ministry was spent among them, said that the men thus honoured confessed, when they were questioned, that the Holy Ghost used the negro dialect, never the speech of a white man. That pricked the bubble, and proved the inspiration to be a mental hallucination. True spirituality is catholic and cosmopolitan. It moves along that level of

common sense which is a universal inheritance and possession. It deals with realities which lie close to all earnest thought. All souls are alike, and God does not change. He cannot be to me what He is to no one else. His impartiality as the Father of all men forbids the notion that He will make me the special and exclusive organ of a revelation which wakes no response in any other heart, and which good and true men reject as blasphemous and silly. So I would rather mistrust my own judgment than break with the general drift of testimony in the living community of believers. There is a *via media* between intellectual isolation and an unreasonable subjection to traditional judgment. True thought is like a magnet introduced into a mixture of iron particles and sands. It sifts by attracting. The thought which attracts nothing to itself proclaims itself thereby unmagnetized and untrue. What I see everybody else can see, if they will only use their eyes, though no one may see it until I direct his attention to it; but if no one can see what I claim to see, the natural inference is that there is something wrong with my eyes, and that it is time for me to consult an oculist. No one can see for me; but the general perception is more trustworthy than my own. For if a thing is real, it must at least be real to every one who is constituted as I am. It is not otherwise with spirituality or the perception of invisible realities. These, too, must be dismissed as illusions, unless other men yield their prompt assent. They may have escaped attention, but they must compel conviction from every honest and thoughtful man. Upon no other theory can we cherish the assurance that Christianity is destined to supplant every other religion. It must triumph by its inherent energy to subdue all rational and sober thought. With this corresponds the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Individuals are the organs of his special revelation, and so become qualified to act as inspired prophets and apostles, only because the entire household of faith is under his instruction and guidance. The apostle does not stand alone; he is only the organ of the Church, making clear and articulate the universal conviction, vague in the many, definite in him, and through him becoming definite in all.

The Church is spoken of as the Body and the Bride of Christ; and union with Christ by the Spirit is always represented as involving spiritual fellowship with the Christian community. The tuition of the spirit is not exclusively individualistic; it is also generic and social. It is carried on, corrected, and completed in the household of faith. It may seem as if the estimate of God and of man which I have so frequently emphasized as the sources of spiritual power are the spontaneous suggestions of clear thinking; but they are not. They have never emerged as vitalising elements in pagan philosophy. That God is Father, and that man is His child is the peculiar and authoritative testimony on the nature and relations of God and man which is the priceless heritage of the Christian Church. You and I have learned the lesson from her lips, though it depends upon us whether it shall be merely a traditional shibboleth or a vital and vitalising truth. It is not true because she has taught it; she has taught it because it is true; but we have come to the knowledge of it through the sacraments which she has administered, and through the prayers which we have caught from her lips. So far I, too, am a Churchman, and draw back from the erratic tendency of an isolated individualism. I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, which is the household of the Spirit, and to which consentient testimony I bow, as embodying a profounder and healthier wisdom than my own. And in so doing I learn to distinguish between the shadow and the substance, between a mere mental impression, however vivid, and the living reality, which is universal and cogent in many minds, between an illusion and a revelation. Other men, too, have the Spirit of God, and are guided by Him, and He cannot be supposed to produce isolated and contradictory impressions; so that comparison and elemination of that which is purely individual must help us in the discovery of what the Spirit's teaching really is. This will secure for us mental modesty and moral sobriety, indispensable qualities for the Christian preacher.

The critical and sifting process must be carried a step farther. For the Church that now is is herself the product and the vehicle of an inherited faith. In this matter the third century has no advantage over the nineteenth. The stream must be traced to its sources, for in the origin of the Church we must find the root of her past and her present authority. The documentary records of our faith, therefore, are, and must ever be, of special significance. If we must test and correct our subjective mental impressions by the spiritual testimony of the Church, we are further bound to test and correct the latter by the judgment of the Holy Oracles, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. This legitimates the Great Reformation of the sixteenth century, and constitutes the sufficient and unanswerable reply to the charge of schism, for the separation was made inevitable by the movement of return to the form of Christian doctrine as contained in the Pauline Epistles, to which, on any theory, a higher authority must be conceded than to any subsequent decrees of Councils or judgments of individual men. No interpretation of Christianity can maintain its ground which does not fully and fearlessly challenge comparison with the transmitted testimony of those who founded the Church. Pure Christianity must be primitive Christianity, in its ruling conceptions and principles, whatever enrichment subsequent thought may have added, either to creed or ritual. The oak is not the acorn, but the germinant seed

contains the type and the law of all succeeding development. That which is an involuntary and necessitated process in physics must be secured by critical comparison in all movements of voluntary life. The State perpetually appeals to its fundamental law, to the intention of its founders, whose political wisdom it hesitates to call in question; for it may be assumed that the men who are summoned to meet great and grave emergencies will be guided to discharge their duties with a sagacity and a courage equal to the task. The stars on the national banner may be increased fourfold within a century, but the flag remains the same, and the ruling ideas of the constitution continue to be the controlling forces of the national development. Christianity with its wider outlook, conscious of its Divine origin and ambitious of universal supremacy, s forced to the most careful and exhaustive criticism of its documentary records, which contain the story of the planting and the training of the Church. The New Testament must be our final court of appeal, compelling us to reject all that is subversive of its teaching, and remanding to the sphere of personal liberty everything upon which it does not speak with clear and decisive authority.

Primitive Christianity is the only rational formal basis of Christian union, not the Councils of the first six centuries, nor even the Apostles' Creed, whose doctrines of Christ's descent into Hades trenches upon the inferential and doubtful. So long as this result has not been reached, the debate between Wittenberg and Rome cannot be concluded; and within the lines of Protestantism the severe cross-examination must continue until the ferment and the friction of thought shall undermine all unauthorised claims, eliminate all foreign elements in doctrine, polity, and ritual, restoring the simplicity and the vitality of the apostolic faith. A historic episcopate, for example, is an illogical compromise and an impossible condition to Christian catholicity. Its antiquity may be admitted, its beneficent historical influence may be granted, but it can never be made binding unless the Acts and the Epistles disclose its apostolic institution. The testimony of the Church is not to be lightly esteemed, and we should be hesitant to charge its leaders with deliberate deception, but we are bound to test all its judgments by the authority of the Scriptures, which, on any theory of their origin, is primary, and so far plenary and final. If we may not break with the living Church, much more, and on that very account, may we not break with our Bibles. Spirituality must move within the sphere of Scriptural testimony. Our mental impressions must be tested and corrected by the records which contain the primitive revelation. Our views of what God is and what man is must combine into exact and harmonious proportions all that is disclosed in precept and in promise, in judgment and in blessings, in personal discipline and in national history. God and the soul are the great, permanent, invisible realities; they constitute, for us, the moral and eternal universe; and of these realities, the Scriptures give us the oldest, the completest, and the most authoritative account. They constitute a carefully-prepared and sifted library on these important themes, which we neglect at our peril in the study of God and of man; and spirituality preserves its healthy tone, guarded from the extravagances of unregulated individual conceit, only by a careful and habitual attention to what the Holy Oracles teach. They must be our celestial telescope, through which we discover the secrets of the Invisible Being.

One more step must be taken. For while the Scriptures are the authentic and authoritive record of the revelation of God to man, they are not themselves the revelation. The Divine disclosure, as the record plainly shows, passed from lower to ever higher stages. It became more definite, more exalted, more fruitful, more energetic, until it culminated in the holy mystery of the Incarnation. Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; but in Jesus Christ the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily. It is a long step from Moses to Isaiah, and a longer step from Malachi to John. If we had only Moses we should have much; but having Christ, it behoves us to honour Him as our Master. It is the theology of Christ we want. It is the spiritual vision of Christ; his estimate of God and of man which we should strive to attain. And by that I do not mean the separation of Christ and of His teaching from all that preceded His advent and followed after His ascension. Cut the heart out of the body, and both become lifeless. Christ is the heart of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures, and the criticism which proceeds upon the principle of excision will have neither a living Christ nor a living Bible. The God-man emerges in the fulness of time, and He can be understood only in the light of His vital environment, as the hope of all the prophets, and as He to whom all apostles bear joyful and united testimony. But He is the sun in the hierarchy of spiritual teachers. He is the vine in whom we must have our abiding, if we are to have much fruit. His flesh we must eat and His blood we must drink. At His feet we must sit, and His Spirit must transfigure our own. We must not only preach what He preached, and as He preached it. It is not enough to hide behind Him; He must shine through us, stirring our hearts, shaping our thoughts, illumining our faces.

Ringing the changes on the sentences and clauses of the creeds of Chalcedon and Constantinople is not preaching Christ. An orthodox Christology does not constitute you a Christian preacher. Eloquent and impassioned eulogy of the Cross is not preaching Christ and Him crucified. He must subdue you until your whole rational, emotional, and volitional life moves along

the level of His own, until His estimates of God and of the soul become your own, and secure your glad and habitual subjection. For He was God and He was man. He understood both exhaustively, and in His active and passive obedience the mighty achievement of human rescue and redemption was secured. So the world needs to know not only what He is, and what He has done, but what He thought about God and man. Nay, more, God is what He is, and man ought to be what He is; so that every problem, Divine and human, finds in Him its solution. He must be our guide in the interpretation of the Scriptures. For critical and scientific purposes, it is well to trace the revelation of God in its historical development; but for practical purposes, and in preaching, the order should be reversed, and the voice of Jesus Christ be made to ring in the ears of men. Do not tarry in the outer court. Do not linger in the holy place. The veil has been rent, and you should not stay until your hands are on the Mercy Seat. Make Christ's estimate your own. Think of Him as the manifested God. His tears at the grave of Lazarus and over doomed Jerusalem, His prayer on the Cross for those who put Him to death, and His dying charge to John to care for His broken-hearted mother, are worth more as a disclosure of what God really is than all the laboured conceits of the scholastic philosophers. Get your theology from the parable of the prodigal son. Think of justice as having tears in it. Make the Fatherhood of God, as taught by Christ, and illustrated by His conduct among men, real to yourself, and your preaching will have spiritual power. There is anger in God, but it is always the anger of outraged Fatherhood; and that gives to the Divine anger its moral majesty and power. And what man is you can best learn from Him who brake bread with publicans and sinners, who blessed the little children, who prayed for Peter that his faith might not fail, and whose withering curse fell only upon one class of men, the hypocrites, souls honeycombed with falsehood, in whom moral integrity had been deliberately crushed out. The world needs His Gospel, the Church needs His Spirit more; and His Gospel will not conquer until His Spirit pervades and rules the Church. Nor will it ever pervade and rule the Church so long as it is any way restrained in us, who believe ourselves commissioned to preach the Gospel in Christ's name. You must have Peter's vision, that nothing which God has made, and upon which He has set the seal of His ownership and adoption, is common or unclean. The man who is not ready to be the servant of the most degraded has not the spirit of Christ in him; and though he may be tolerated in the Church, he is unfit to take the lowest place in the ranks of the Christian ministry.

Here I must leave you face to face with Him, whom, having not seen, you love, in whom you trust, to whose service you have pledged your lives, and with whom you must walk, if you would know the truth and secure the baptism of power. I have taxed your attention long; but the supreme importance of the theme must be my apology and justification.

ERRATA.—In the last number, page 15, line 12, *for* "cannot," *read* "can partially," and line 14, *for* "yet," *read* "and."

THE prebendal stall of Brondesbury, which was vacated by the Bishop of St. Albans, has been conferred by the Bishop of London on the Rev. J. H. Snowden, vicar of St. Paul's, Hammersmith.

ARCHDEACON HAIGH, vicar of Newport, in the Isle of Wight, has been offered and has accepted the canonry in Winchester Cathedral vacant by the death of Canon Butler. It is stated that the Archdeacon will resign his vicarage, but will continue to hold the office of Archdeacon.

THE BISHOP of CHESTER has offered the honorary canonry vacant by the resignation of Canon W. Saumarez Smith, now Bishop of Sydney, to the Rev. Alfred Maitland Wood, M.A., vicar of Runcorn, who has accepted it. Mr. Wood was 31st Wrangler and was ordained by the Bishop of Chester in 1865. He was curate of Tarvin from 1865 to 1871 and of Wallasey from 1871 to 1878. In 1878 he became vicar of St. Mary's, Liscard, where he remained until 1886, when he was appointed vicar of Runcorn by the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, Oxford.

AT a large gathering of the parishioners of Christ Church, St. Pancras, in the parochial schools, on Saturday evening, under the presidency of Dr. Gill, a cheque for £500 and some handsome silver candelabra were presented to the Bishop of St. Albans. The Chairman having briefly recapitulated the clerical career of their late vicar, the Bishop, who was greatly moved, said he thanked them from the bottom of his heart for that crowning instance of their regard. He had always received from them the most generous confidence and cordial co-operation. They had responded to every wish of his, and there had never been an instance of work being interrupted through misunderstanding. He exhorted them to receive his successor with similar kindness, and, above all, to maintain their Church schools.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.'

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 19, 1890.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

THE subject of Foreign Missions is one that is always, more or less, before the eyes of Churchmen, and certainly never more than at the present time, when nearly every Missionary Society is holding its annual meeting in the metropolis. Reports are read and adopted, and invited speakers address large audiences on the paramount importance of supporting this or that Society, at the same time pleading for more help, more interest, more sympathy. No one condemns all this zeal and enthusiasm, rather should it be encouraged; but the question does force itself upon us as we read the long list of Societies which hold their annual meeting during the London season—Is there not in all these Societies a great waste of power? Is it necessary to have so many Societies, each with its separate organization, secretaries, treasurers, committees, etc., for the one great work of carrying the Word of God to the perishing heathen in different parts of the world. In looking through the Official Year Book of the Church of England, we find that there are no less than *eight* Missionary Societies, and in addition *ten* special mission agencies, and we also know that many parishes for certain reasons support some special mission, because, possibly, the Bishop of some distant See is connected in some way or other with the parish, and therefore commands a certain amount of support in consequence. Of the eight Missionary Societies referred to, some of them might well be fused together into some of the existing organisations; for instance, we cannot see why the South American Missionary Society could not be worked in connection with the Church Missionary Society. As far as we know, there is no difference in theological views between the supporters of the two Societies; and if, as it is alleged, that the Church Missionary Society's great aim is only to preach the Gospel to the heathen, then we are sure that the South American Missionary Society is doing the very same for some of those who are under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the Falkland Islands, and are heathen quite as much as those under the jurisdiction of some of the Bishops who receive help from the Church Missionary Society. With regard to some of the special missions, if we except the Oxford Mission to Calcutta and the Cambridge mission to Delhi, which were formed under exceptional circumstances, and to recognize the fact that the two ancient Universities should willingly send out some of their best and ablest sons to go and teach the polished Hindoos and Brahmins, we see no reason whatever why some of the other agencies should not be under the auspices of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, or the Church Missionary Society, for while there is all this enthusiasm, the scattering of the forces, and the dividing of the work into so many fragments, must be to a certain extent injurious. The old motto, "unity is strength," is indeed true in this, as it is also in other matters. We are quite aware that some excuse will be pleaded because the Standing Committee of the S. P. G. some few years ago cast off and, to a certain extent, repudiated the existence of so many special missions, the funds of which they had hitherto been the almoners. With the wisdom or otherwise of the action of the Society in this matter it is not to our purpose to discuss; we only desire to show that it is very questionable whether the existence of so many Societies does not weaken instead of strengthening and solidifying the work.

We remember hearing at the Manchester Church Congress, the Bishop of Calcutta pleading very earnestly for a Church Board of Missions; and stating that, in his opinion, the time had come when it should not be this Society's work or that Society's work, but that it was the work of the Church of England to undertake missions, and that she should have her duly-constituted Board of Missions. There is no doubt that this is the true principle, and we sincerely hope that this will ultimately be brought about. It will take time, and it may be indefinitely prolonged, but it is the true solution of the difficulty. And with the establishment of the Church House, which according to the plans of its originators is to be the focus and radiating centre of all outward Church life, so then it appears that this great work of Foreign Missions might well be one of the first and certainly one of the noblest works which it can undertake.

In America the Protestant Episcopal Church has its duly constituted Board of Missions, and we believe that when any fresh departure in mission

work is undertaken, it is always with the consent and approval of the Board. And as we have taken a copy from the American Church with respect to the Church House, there does not appear to be any logical reason why we should not take a copy from her in this respect also, if by that means we are to gain more strength with regard to the Foreign Mission work of the Church. It is sometimes a cause of complaint, that there is little interest taken in mission work by our ordinary Church-going people; and if that be so, we think that the system of the ordinary stereotyped deputation, the annual sermon and meeting has much to do with it. Sometimes also the publications are dull and uninteresting, and this is undoubtedly true as regards our Society, but we trust that this will be remedied before long. Further, we think that much more might be done by the Parochial Clergy themselves by forming Missionary Unions, and also the carrying out of a suggestion made by the Bishop of Lichfield, viz., that when there are five Sundays in a month, on the evening of the fifth Sunday instead of the ordinary sermons the incumbent should give an address on some special phase of missionary work, or put before the people the work of some special field of missionary enterprise. We have no desire to condemn the work of any of the existing Societies, all that we are anxious to see is greater concentration of the work, feeling that such concentration will be of untold value for the future success of Foreign Missions.

Reviews and Notices.

"Lux Mundi." Edited by Charles Gore.

This series of essays has made a great noise in the world, less from its actual contents, than from the place, from whence it has proceeded, The Pusey House, Oxford. That institution, which was supposed to be the home of the most unimpeachable orthodoxy, has astonished the world by a manifesto, issued in the names of a large number of the younger leaders of the most advanced sacerdotal and sacramental school, in which an attempt is made to reconcile their particular views of Christianity with the scientific dogma of Evolution, and with the latest result of historical criticism of the Old Testament and partly of the New. It is a change of front as remarkable, in its way, as that which Mr. Gladstone made, when he declared for Home Rule in Ireland; and it is not inconceivable that the book may have a similar success, in converting a large section of the High Church party, into partisans of the new departure. We propose to make it the subject of a dispassionate review.

It acknowledges very frankly in its preface the source from which it proceeds. It is the work of an University *coterie*, consisting of men who are bound to each other by ties of private friendship, accustomed to act together, and to compare the results of their studies; and, we may perhaps venture to add, not unaccustomed to the practice of mutual admiration, and to the use *inter se* of a jargon of academical phraseology, which outsiders like ourselves suspect to be words only, but which they suppose to represent facts of that unseen world, which is beyond the reach of human dialectics.

The writers aim at divesting their readers of prejudices. Yet they themselves start with an enormous one. They assume, not merely the truth of Christianity in general, but also that of the Creed as settled in the fourth and fifth centuries, and take up at once the position of Defenders or Apologists, "not as guessers at truth, but as servants of the Catholic Creed and Church, aiming only at interpreting the faith which they have received." They think that in an age of "profound transformation" like the present, "theology must take a new development," involving "great changes in the outlying departments of itself, where it is linked on to other sciences, and necessitating some general restatement of its claims and meaning." The outlying department of theology, which they wish specially to transform, is the view, hitherto prevalent in the Church, of Holy Scripture. For them, the central truths of Christianity are no longer the original teaching of Jesus Christ, nor even of the Apostles, but the dogmatic conclusion respecting the nature of the Deity and of the Person of Christ arrived at by the great teachers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and formulated as dogmas by the councils of that period. This was the period in which, for them, Christianity took its definite and final form. They admit that the first Christians were no theologians. In fact, these were children content with the simple childlike expression of their faith; but this period of childhood must necessarily pass away; Christians, grown to intellectual manhood, must require a logical expression of their faith, and thus Christianity was bound to develop a theology, which could only be expressed in the terms which it borrowed from the Greek philosophers and logicians. Thus, for these writers, the intellectual expression of Christianity is moved down three centuries from its origin; its author left his religion hidden from the wise and prudent, but revealed unto the babe, yet requiring to be systematized by men like the theological writers of the fourth century. We fear that we must venture to describe Mr. Gore and his coadjutors by parodying the words of a famous dream of Jerome—*Athanasiani estis non Christiani*. The Christianity which they hold and recommend is that of Athanasius, not that of Jesus Christ.

The essays which compose the book may be separated into two divisions, those whose object is to defend their authors' sacerdotal view of Christianity, and those which seek to reconcile that view with the hypothesis of Evolution, and with the results of historical criticism. A good example of the former class is the essay of Mr. Paget, in which he deals with the sacramental system, of which all these writers are devoted adherents. This essay is a very rhetorical one, the whole solid matter of which might be easily condensed into a page. It defines the sacramental system as "the regular use of sensible objects, agents, and acts, as being the means or instruments of Divine energies, the vehicles of saving and sanctifying power;" and asserts that, although the sacramental principle is, at first sight, not prominent in the Gospel narratives, yet that it has most plainly been adopted by our Lord, as the spiritual force, by which He would renew the world. The scriptural foundation of these assertions is not strong; and the chief part of the essay is employed

in showing the adaptation of the system to the mixed bodily and spiritual nature of man. But the writer hardly touches the real difficulty of accepting these sacramental views, which is, that experience does not show that the vast effects attributed to sacramental grace are really produced, even in the case of persons who present no obstacle to the supernatural action of the Divine power. Perhaps Mr. Paget would kindly supply this defect in the next edition, if his attention were directed to it. We will, therefore, point it out to him with reference to each of the Sacraments, which for him (notwithstanding the 25th Article) are at least seven, and very probably more. With respect to baptism, in the case of infants, no effects whatever can be observed to follow the sacramental communication of spiritual grace. We borrow the following statement of this fact from a source quite above suspicion, J. H. Newman.*

I say, then, we have these startling appearances :—

Persons brought up without baptism may show themselves just the same in character, temper, opinions, and conduct, with those who have been baptised ; or, when these differ from those, this difference may be sufficiently or exactly accounted for by their education.

An unbaptised person may be brought up with baptised persons, and acquire their tone of thought, their mode of viewing things, and their principles and opinions, just as if he were baptised. He may suppose that he has been baptised, and others may think so ; and, on inquiry, it may be found out that he has not been baptised.

On the other hand, a baptised person may acquire the ways of going on, and the sentiments and modes of talking of those who despise baptism, and seem neither better nor worse than they, but just the same.

An unbaptised person may in after-life be baptised ; and if quiet and religious before, may remain so afterwards, with no change of any kind in his own consciousness about himself, or in the impression of others about him.

Or, he may have had a formed character before baptism, and not a pleasing one ; he may have been rude and irreverent, or worldly-minded. He may have improved ; he may have had faith sufficient to bring him to baptism, and, as far as we can judge, may have received it worthily ; yet he may remain, improved just so much as is implied in his having faith to come to baptism, but apparently in no greater measure.

Or, he may come to baptism and improve after it, but only in such way as to all appearance he might have improved without having received it when he did—viz., from the intercourse of friends, from reading religious books, from study and thought, or from the trials of life.

Again, he may come to Baptism as a mere form, or from worldly motives, and yet in appearance be no worse than he was before. If he had a mixture of good and evil in him before, the same apparently remains.

And again, whether he has received baptism or not, he is liable to the same changes of mind, to the same religious influences, nay, may run through the same spiritual course, may be gradually moulded on the same habits,—perhaps be affected in some remarkable way, so remarkable that it may be called a conversion, and what he himself may incorrectly call a regeneration,—which it cannot be, if we judge according to Scripture, not appearance, since he either has been already regenerated in baptism, or has not yet been regenerated, being unbaptised. Yet the same religious experience (as it sometimes is called) may befall him, whether he has been baptised or not.

We have given this long quotation for the sake of its exhaustiveness. J. H. Newman's conclusion is that here experience is counter to faith, and that we must trust faith in spite of experience. What is Mr. Paget's conclusion in view of these facts?

Similar phenomena may be observed with regard to the effects of Mr. Paget's other six sacraments.

In Confirmation, the effects result, not from the ceremony, but from the impressive advice of the Bishop, and still more from the careful previous preparation by the catechising clergyman.

Frequent Communion often weakens the effect of that ordinance ; and, as Mr. Paget probably will admit, has, in those classes in which it is at present most practised, been coincident with moral and even religious decline.

Ordination does not produce in the clergy a more spiritual mind, greater truthfulness, clearer insight, or even correcter morals, than in the unordained.

As to Penitence, a great part of those confessed and absolved are like bankrupts relieved of their responsibilities, who begin at once to contract fresh debts.

As to Marriage, it has not been more pure, in countries where it has been universally treated as a sacrament. In France, in the age of Louis XV., marriage was exclusively sacramental, and generally corrupt.

As to Extreme Unction, where it is practised, every one receives it without distinction, whatever his past life may have been ; nor could it be refused to anyone, who asked for it on the plea of penitence, without breach of charity. Its effects, being all in the unseen world, are unobservable by man.

It is facts of experience like these which advocates of the sacramental system must meet, if they would have their own views adopted by truthful men.

Similar reflections are suggested by Mr. Walter Lock's essay on the Church. That gentleman starts with three *à priori* ideas :—

1. That the religious life of an individual cannot be realised in isolation ;
2. That religious knowledge can only be spread and perpetuated by means of associations ;
3. And that worship can only be offered worthily, in union with a body of worshippers.

And he adds that these ideas are realised in the externally organised Church, as the body, through which the benefits which flow from the Incarnation of Christ are communicated to the world, as "the home of grace, the channel of spiritual life."

The answer to this is, that, as a matter of experience, the historical body, to which Mr. Lock exclusively confines the name of Church, is not the only place in which his three *à priori* ideas are realised. Other bodies, which have sprung up and grown beyond its pale, have been found to produce as rich and pure a religious life, as the historic Church itself, to be more successful than it in diffusing religious knowledge, and to become homes of a more spiritual and more truthful worship. The general diffusion of spiritual gifts amongst a number of Christian bodies is the negation, by the Deity Himself, of the exclusive claims, which these writers somewhat superciliously allege for the external historic body, whose advocates and apologists they are proud to be.

But the chief importance and interest of this book lies, not in the defence which it contains, of the old opinions of the school from whence it emanates, but in the new departure which it announces, in the two matters of Evolution, and of the criticism of Scripture.

These writers accept the doctrine of Evolution unreservedly as the key to the whole history of the Universe and of Man. But they hardly attempt to meet the two great difficulties which a Christian finds in the way of accepting that doctrine. These are :—

1. That the history of mankind, as stated in the Old Testament, and endorsed by the New, is totally different from, and irreconcilable with, that presented

* Sermons on Subjects of the Day, vi., Faith and Experience, p. 77.

for our acceptance by the doctrine of Evolution. To the Evolutionist man has been gradually evolved from a succession of lower types by physical generation. To the writers of Scripture, he was, at the beginning, made very good, formed in the image and likeness of God, and is fallen from that high estate. The two ideas are quite incompatible. The Christian, who adopts the doctrine of Evolution, may hold that the Incarnation of Christ was the development of a higher type of humanity in his person, destined to lead hereafter to the development of a higher type in the whole species ; but he can no longer hold that man is fallen from a higher state, and requires redemption, restoration, recovery.

2. The other difficulty is a physical matter. Mr. Gore and his coadjutors would feel horrified at the thought that the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, which they consider the central doctrine of Christianity, could only have taken place by the natural process of generation. But the theory, which they have adopted, actually requires from them that admission, for it knows no other way in which a human being could be born.

Writers like those of *Lux Mundi*, accustomed to view their subjects through the mist of theological rhetoric, have probably not quite realised themselves to what a tremendous issue they must be conducted by that new departure, which they have entered upon with so light a heart. Their "Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation" have struck a deadly blow at the heart of that doctrine itself.

In the other matter, of the criticism of Scripture, Mr. Gore, whose essay deals with that portion of their subject, confines his attention to the Old Testament almost entirely ; and, upon this, he sees no objection to the most destructive results of modern criticism. He recognises a considerable *idealizing* element in the Old Testament : he supposes compositions like The Song of Solomon, Job, Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, and even the Book of Deuteronomy to be *dramatic* writings. Deuteronomy may be "a republication of the Law in the spirit and power of Moses put dramatically into his mouth." Though "the prophets see deeper under the surface of life what God is doing, and therefore further into the future what He will do," yet "their inspiration is consistent with erroneous anticipations as to the circumstances and opportunity of God's self-revelation." The earlier narratives before the call of Abraham may be "myths," conveying to us in the form of an allegorical picture "the great inspirations about the origin of all things, the nature of sin, the judgment of God on sin, and the alienation among men, which follows their alienation from God."

He admits that this was not the view of their sacred books, and of the history contained in them, that prevailed among the Jews ; and that "our Lord, in His use of the Old Testament, does indeed endorse with the utmost emphasis the Jewish view of their own history." But the limitation of knowledge, which our Lord thus displayed, he traces to the "self-emptying of God to reveal himself under the conditions of human nature." In fact, the Founder of Christianity was to these writers a person of limited information and intelligence, even on so fundamental a matter as the truth of Scripture.

This is the position which Mr. Gore assumes with regard to the Old Testament. But he protests that these modes of interpretation cannot be applied to the New without results disastrous to the Christian creed.

It seems to us obvious that this position is quite untenable. If the history of the Old Testament is to be interpreted as idealisation, as dramatic representation, the same method must also be applied to the New, which would lend itself to the process with equal, if not greater, readiness. Mr. Gore and his coadjutors must be prepared for such an application. If it were alleged to them that the event of Pentecost may be only a dramatic representation of the rise of a new enthusiasm, that the Resurrection may be only a drama exhibiting the immortality of Christ's personality and Christ's work, nay, even the Incarnation, their central fact, merely a poem depicting the appearance in the world of a person of ideal purity and holiness, what could they possibly reply, except that such interpretation would destroy the whole fabric of Christianity, which they desire to maintain ? They cannot deny that they are legitimate applications of their own methods of interpretation.

These writers have probably entered on their new departure with feelings analogous to those of their great predecessor of another generation—

> I do not ask to see
> The distant scene, one step enough for me.

But such action is not excusable in any who, like them, have the charge of a number of young susceptible minds. They should have seen many steps before them ere they ventured on a new departure, which involves such momentous and far-reaching consequences.

"The Wider Hope." London : T. Fisher Unwin.

In the year 1878, Archdeacon Farrar published "Eternal Hope," a volume which, to quote the preface to the book before us, "excited universal attention in theological circles, and amongst thinkers of all branches of the Christian Church." It did ; it also unintentionally displayed the unlearnedness of the average clergyman, who generally looked upon Canon Farrar's opinions as a novel heresy—an invention altogether of his own. At once a controversy sprung up, and of course the Magazines saw their opportunity, especially the *Contemporary*, wherein a series of papers appeared, now republished in the volume before us. We think their republication a great mistake. Almost all bear marks of haste, not a few marks of temper. Whatever interest or value they had, was purely temporary ; they have long since been forgotten—buried beneath the pile of more and more magazine articles ; to disinter them seems to us nothing short of cruelty to their writers. They add nothing to the literature of the subject, nothing to the fame of their authors.

Moreover, for another reason these papers should never have been republished, they are so intensely personal. It would be unjust to compare them to political "leaders" in a party organ, for that is the lowest type possible ; but they do savour a little of the penny press. Canon Farrar may or may not be too rhetorical—but his style does not affect the truth or falsehood of the doctrine (whatever that doctrine may be) which he teaches in "Eternal Hope." And to advise him (as some of the writers do) to preach repentance and a present salvation instead, is absurd and unfair—absurd, because it is wholly beside the question ; unfair, because he *does* so preach in his other sermons, and indeed in "Eternal Hope" too.

However, the volume contains an essay by Dr. Quincey which is worth reading, and a list of works on Eschatology which may be useful, and for this much wheat amongst so much chaff we are grateful.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHAT IS TO BE ADORED?

SIR,—I should think that the observations of a rather obscure Irish newspaper on the Bennett case must be a very uninteresting subject to most of your readers. Remarks on them, of course, may be harmless; but it can scarcely be said that all the remarks in Mr. Crosthwaite's letter of to-day are so. I refer to this:—"How long did Romanists and Protestants humbug us by the notion that the bread from heaven of John vi. was our Lord's Body, though what came down from heaven was His Deity, and not His human Body?" This must be taken as the re-assertion of a very peculiar view of Mr. Crosthwaite on the proper understanding of the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel, and of its bearing on the Doctrine of the Eucharist. I beg to suggest that your correspondent, instead of characterizing the conscientiously held, and almost universal, understanding, of that discourse as "humbug," should give some respectable authority in theological literature in support of his own view. I beg also to suggest, that if Mr. Crosthwaite will not abstain from such language as above, you, sir, should discourage it according to your ability. Vulgarity may be only first cousin of profanity; but it is own brother of irreverence.

There is more in the letter that is objectionable, not, however, because it is offensive, but because it is illogical. "How long will people, contrary to their senses, etc." No one who knows what the Romanist doctrine of the Presence, in its various shades, is, could ask this question. But as mere ignorance is not actively mischievous, there is no occasion for me to remark much on this.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

12th July, 1890.

"A YEAR WITH THE GERMAN REEDS."

SIR,—It has been my privilege to contribute to the PULPIT more or less frequently during the last ten years, in the columns devoted to Sermons, Articles, Papers, Reviews and Correspondence, thus dealing with a variety of subjects. I was asked last week why we took such a wide line, and I also heard it suggested that pecuniary interests were involved in the subject of your last two leaders. I now proceed to answer both these questions. Ever since you, sir, took the helm, I believe that the PULPIT has strongly enforced the unseverable bond (in this life) betwixt mind and matter—body, soul and spirit, "for health and immortality." Its help and advocacy therefore, may be fairly claimed by any work really conducive to the promotion of man's social and moral well-being. *Such* an object, then, is his mental recreation, and the improvement of his artistic tastes and skill. While it has no more to do with the "fine arts" or games of skill (not *chance*), as such, than other publications of the same class, it may well concern itself with them in so far as they tend to make us better men or women and better Christians. In the present instance it is occupied with a question which I make bold to assert it answers fairly and impartially. Where, without exposure to the dangers of the theatre or music hall, can we take our young people, or those for whom it is desirable that they should see good acting and hear good singing? Do we want to improve talent, to cultivate taste, or, by contrast, to repress conceit and that silly craze for the "Profession," which is, alas! so common? The German Reeds' entertainment will answer all these purposes, or furnish the cultivated critic with something worth listening to. The articles are not a cut and dried Press notice, but the actual impressions of a constant auditor—one of the "clerical collars" referred to. Neither you, sir, the entertainment itself, nor I, have any *pecuniary* interest in the matter. There is nothing of the "Limited" or "and Co." character about it. "It stands alone, and holds its own," no easy thing to do in these days of competition and shams of every description. As anyone may see from the advertisements, it is "Licensed to, and under the management of, Mr. Alfred German Reed and Mr. Corney Grain." A reader observed to me that the persons referred to "ought to feel greatly obliged"; but the obligation lies on *my* side, not theirs. I have derived many hours of welcome recreation from them at a time of much sorrow of heart and vexation of spirit. They have bid dull care begone for me again and again. I feel therefore that if any word of mine should cause others to visit them, it will be a very inadequate return for what I have received.

THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLES.

THE TOORMORE CASE.

SIR,—The Roman Catholic Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise has been preaching on the subject of education, and some of his remarks are worthy of attention at a moment when Mr. Gladstone and his followers are urging people to hand the government of Ireland over to the Nationalists. "He would rather," he is reported to have said, "see a father and mother offer their child to be burned than hear that they had been in the habit of sending their children to Protestant schools." And again:—"He would not administer the sacrament of confirmation to any child who he understood was going to any Protestant school in any parish in the diocese of Ardagh. He would not deny that there were many Protestants who were very worthy persons, and who had many virtues; but the Church taught them that a Protestant school was not a place for their children. To send their children to Protestant schools is as if they went to live in a place where the air was infected, and where, without knowing it, they might imbibe the seeds of disease and death."

THOMAS B. NAYLOR.

Warrenpoint.

SIR,—Will you kindly afford me a small space in your columns to give the most unqualified denial to those reports in circulation as to 50 families of Protestants having seceded to the Church of Rome from

my parish? Such is an unmitigated falsehood. The real facts are as follows:—A pauper named Baylie (mere nominal Protestant) having been evicted from some Church lands which he had been overholding possession of after the expiration of his lease, conceived the idea that I, being the clergyman of the parish, was to receive the future profits of the said lands. Primed with this idea (wholly unfounded) he resolved to become revenged on me, and in order to do so went with his son to Mass, and there got rebaptized.

A second case was that of a man whose daughter I had occasion to reprimand, owing to her having joined in a riotous mob on a Sunday afternoon, and aiding said mob in assailing my Church, my congregation and myself, and thereby obstructing me in the celebration of Divine Service. This man has gone to Mass, taking with him his four children. It is to be noted that this man and all his ancestors having been originally Roman Catholics left their own Church in the famine years—not by reason of any conscientious conviction, but tempted by the charity then being distributed in this locality. This wretched man was never a Protestant, nor in truth anything but a poor misguided deceiver, sunk in the grossest ignorance, and never attending any place of worship either Roman Catholic or Protestant.

This man with his four children, in company with Baylie and his son, constitute the sum total of those who on this occasion are reported in the Nationalist journals as having deserted the Protestant Church in this parish. Thus the 50 families come to dwindle in number to seven individuals, and those seven in no degree whatever influenced by the spirit of religion, but rather instigated by the deadliest spite towards me for imaginary wrongs.

The Nationalist party in their over-anxiety to bring grist to their mill have evidently overdone themselves in reporting so large a number as 50 families—the absurdity was too monstrous for belief.

EDWARD H. HOPLEY.

Toormore, Skibbereen, co. Cork,
July 9th, 1890.

CANON KNOX LITTLE has returned from Pontresina, where he has been recruiting his health, and goes into residence at Worcester.

THE DEAN of ST. DAVID'S (the Very Rev. James Allen) met with a serious accident whilst leaving his house on Thursday evening, the 10th inst., for the cathedral service. He was proceeding down the steps of his residence when he stumbled and fell, and had to be carried indoors, and has since been confined to his room, but is progressing satisfactorily.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Astley, Rev. H. D., M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of London.

Bailie, Rev. Albert Victor, B.A., Assistant Chaplain Missions to Seamen at Sunderland.

Bevan, Rev. Evan, Vicar of Llanellen; Vicar of St. Fagan's, Aberdare.

Boyle, Very Rev. G. D., M.A., Dean of Salisbury; Chaplain to the Earl of Glasgow.

Boys, Rev. Herbert Arnold, M.A., English Chaplain at Algiers; Rector of Easton Maudit, near Castle Ashby, Northamptonshire.

Brooke, Rev. Charles Hyde, Vicar of Criggon, Shrewsbury.

Brown, Rev. James Redgate, Vicar of Lyons, Durham.

Coles, Rev. E. T., Vicar of Ashmansworth; Rector of Knight's Enham and Smannell, Andover.

Crosthwaite, Rev. S. Maitland, M.A., Head Master of Maidstone Grammar School; Head Master of Carlisle Grammar School.

Dorling, Rev. Edward Earle, M.A., Assistant-Master of Derby School; Master of the Choristers' School and Vicar Choral in Salisbury Cathedral.

Fisher, Rev. F. H., M.A., Vicar of Fulham; Rector of Debden, Essex.

Forbes, Rev. John Gregory, M.A., Vicar of Hatfield Broad Oak; Vicar of Chesterton, Cambridge.

Haigh, Ven. Archdeacon Henry, M.A., Vicar of Newport, I.W.; Canon of Winchester Cathedral.

Hamlyn, Rev. A. J., Curate of Ellacombe, Torquay; Vicar of St. Paul's, Devonport.

Handford, Rev. W. B., M.A., Assistant-Curate SS. Michael and All Angels', Croydon; Chaplain on Bengal (Lahore) Establishment.

Hodgkinson, Rev. F. K., M.A., Curate of All Saints', Margaret-street; Vicar of St. Mark's, Worsley, Manchester.

Kewley, Rev. Robert Rigby, M.A., Vicar of Wingham, Kent; Vicar of Bucklebury-with-Marlstone, near Reading.

Latimer, Rev. R. J. W., Curate of St. Peter's, Birkdale, Southport; Curate-in-Charge of Woodford, near Salisbury.

Lester, Rev. G. M. L., East London Clergyman.

Maclure, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar of Rochdale and Archdeacon of Manchester; Dean of Manchester.

Manders, Rev. Henry Robert, B.A., Minister of the District of St. Mary-the-Virgin, Horbury.

Muriel, Rev. W. C., M.A., Rector of Debden, Essex; Vicar of Fulham.

Owen, Rev. John Robert Blayney, M.A., Vicar of Toftrees and Rector of Shereford, Norfolk.

Ponsonby, Rev. F. J., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Munster Square; Rural Dean of St. Pancras.

Powell, Rev. F. P. H., M.A., Vicar of Matching, Essex; Vicar of Withycombe Raleigh, Exmouth.

Rigby, Rev. H. W., M.A., Curate of Settrington, Yorkshire; Vicar of Flamborough, East Yorkshire.

Rudge, Rev. E., LL.B., Vicar of Withycombe Raleigh, Exmouth; Vicar of Matching, Essex.

Sissmore, Rev. T. L., M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Bath.

Snowden, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Hammersmith; Prebendary of Brondesbury in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Stamer, Rev. F. C., M.A., Rector of Kingsley, Staffs.

Statham, Rev. Shcrard M., M.A., late Vicar of Stowupland, Suffolk; Rector of Elworthy, Somersetshire.

Stevens, Rev. S. W., Rector of St. Lawrence, Southampton.

Stone, Rev. S. J., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Haggerston; Rector of All Hallows, London Wall.

Streeten, Rev. George Bradley, M.A., Vicar of Scottow, Norfolk.

Williams, Rev. David Bankes, B.A., formerly Curate of Swansea; Perpetual Curate of Michaelstone-super-Avon, Glamorganshire.

Wood, Rev. Alfred Maitland, M.A., Vicar of Runcorn; Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.

Wood, Rev. W. H., Vicar of Ramsey, Essex.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cadwallader, Rev. James, at Littleton-on-Severn Rectory, on the 5th inst., aged 75 years.

Ellis, Rev. Frank Osborne, at his residence, Grove Vale, Great Barr, on the 5th inst., in the 36th year of his age.

Mayow, Rev. P. Wynell, late Vicar of Easton, near Wells, at Shortwood, Wells, Somerset, on the 9th inst., aged 77 years.

Pedder, Rev. John, at 13, Somerset Place, Bath, on the 12th inst., aged 65 years.

Reade, Rev. William, M.A., for eight years Vicar of Marton, at Marton Vicarage, near Gainsborough, suddenly, on the 7th inst., aged 72 years.

Trollope, Edward Pearson, late Vicar of Sheepwash, N. Devon, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 9th inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DIGNITY OF LABOUR.

By the Venerable Archdeacon CHEETHAM, D.D., Canon and Archdeacon of Rochester.

Sermon Preached in St. Nicholas, Rochester, on Sunday, June 8, 1890.

"For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat."—2 Thess. iii. 10.

THERE never was a perfect Church on earth. There are always tares among the wheat. Our Lord warned us that it would be so, and so it has been. There are on earth no perfect men and no perfect Churches. We go on towards perfection, but we never reach it. The perfect Church has as yet only been seen in ecstatic vision; the New Jerusalem, the Holy City, was seen in its glory and purity by the Seer of Patmos, but it is not seen on earth.

St. Paul founded many Churches. There was not one of them in which he did not find something to admire, something to praise, something to love; but there was not one in which he did not find something to blame, something to correct. He founded a Church in Thessalonica. In a short time he had to write about some disorders of which he heard. There were some among the brethren who walked disorderly—in an undignified way, breaking the good order and steadfast life which ought to be in a society bearing the name of Christ. They forgot that God is not a God of disorder or indiscipline, but of law and order. Perhaps some, in their delight at being emancipated from the old law—touch not, taste not, handle not—thought they were set free from law altogether. This feeling was not unknown in the Christian Church of the first age, and has often broken out in the Church of later times. Whatever the cause was, there was disorder, and St. Paul desires his converts to withdraw themselves from every brother that walketh disorderly. And again he says, "If any man obeyeth not our word by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him, to the end that he may be ashamed." And then it instantly seems to occur to him that this may be misunderstood; that it might possibly encourage the Pharisaic spirit—stand off, I am holier than thou; so he adds, "Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." On the one hand, if an offender is suffered to go on without protest, he is encouraged in his evil-doing; they who bid him God-speed are partakers in his evil deeds. On the other, the end of all punishment in the Church is not to develop pride in those who stand, but to raise up those that fall. Indifference to evil is fatal to the tone of any society. The tone of society should help to deter a man from wrong.

But what was the particular form of disorder which St. Paul had to reprobate in Thessalonica? You will observe that a considerable portion of these Epistles to the Thessalonians is occupied with the consideration of the second coming of the Lord. St. Paul begs the Thessalonians not to be troubled by the notion that the day of the Lord was immediately to appear. When he speaks of "a letter as from us," he seems to refer to some epistle which claimed to convey his views, which he had not authorised. Now, when men were thinking that the very next day the Lord might be seen in the clouds of heaven, the dead in Christ gathered first to Him, then the living rising by a new attraction to the real source of light and life; when men were in hourly expectation of such a scene as this, no wonder if some, especially the weaker and more excitable spirits, were unwilling, and indeed almost unable, to go steadily about their daily work, providing for a future which they never expected to see. And such persons had no scruple about being maintained from the common fund of the Church, which was no doubt intended mainly for the sick and infirm. Against fanatics of this kind St. Paul reiterates the homely maxim, which he had given when he was with them—"If any man will not work, neither let him eat." This is the homely rule which was to bring enthusiasts to their senses. Now, St. Paul himself was an enthusiast, if ever man was; he had a burning spirit within him; he could not help doing what he did; necessity was laid upon him; he felt that woe would be to him if he preached not the Gospel; but he is a splendid example that there is no contradiction between enthusiasm and good sense. No man shows more practical good sense. Those excellent people who think that if they have religious emotions they may neglect common duties can certainly not plead the example of St. Paul. And he was also, in the best sense, a proud man. He always asserted that he, and other ministers of Christ, had a perfect right to be maintained by the Church, but he preferred, whenever he could, to be quite independent of such support. Both at Thessalonica and elsewhere he worked with his own hands, no doubt at his trade of tent-making, to gain his subsistence, for which, I have no doubt, very moderate earnings sufficed. Perhaps his labour in this way, in addition to his constant care of all the churches, was one cause of the infirmity of the flesh of which he speaks; however willing the spirit was, the flesh was weak.

St. Paul worked, laboured with his hands; and it is here, in this 2 Thessalonians, that we first find in all literature the assertion of the dignity of labour

of actual working with the hands. The busy bodies —the people who were busy with that which was no business of theirs—he rebukes with emphatic scorn ; and he commands and exhorts such people with great emphasis, even using the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that "with quietness they work, eating their own bread," and not other people's bread. Within the Church of Christ labour was honourable, whatever it might be in the Gentile world. Perhaps you may suppose that labour was honourable everywhere. By no means. The society in which Christianity arose was pervaded by slavery. The word which is generally rendered "servant" in the New Testament really means "bondman." Onesimus was the bondman of Philemon, to whom St. Paul wrote. The word "slave" would be too strong, because it would suggest to us negro slavery, a much more degrading thing than the bond-service of the ancient world, when the bond-servant was often of as good a race as his master, and might be a very well-educated person. But, though slavery in the Roman world was something very different from the negro slavery of modern times, it was still slavery. The slave had no rights, and the greatest political writer of ancient times speaks of the slave as a living tool. And slavery had the same effect upon the masters that slavery always has. When all hand-labour is done by slaves the dominant race comes to despise it. It was so in the Southern States of North America ; the poorest white man there would rather do anything than work with his hands. It certainly was so in the ancient world. People read of the Greek republics, and fancy that they were filled with democratic spirit. Nothing can be further from the truth. The classic pagans had not the smallest notion of social equality. The democracy of a Greek city consisted of a comparatively small body of citizens, men born to citizenship, who alone formed the governing body of the city, surrounded by a body of residents of other races—generally traders, often Jews—and bondmen, none of whom had any civic rights. In relation to the whole population of a city, the citizens formed what we should call an aristocracy, though among themselves they were no doubt extremely jealous of any man, or set of men, who appeared likely to gain undue influence. And these born aristocrats—for such they were—heartily despised anything like handicraft. They had a special word which indicated their contempt for those who worked with their hands, or engaged in the smaller transaction of trade. Free labour was not honoured. The great Greek philosopher and political writer, Aristotle, who lived long, and perhaps was born, in the neighbourhood of Thessalonica, speaks with the utmost contempt of mechanics and labourers. The attitude of the Greek philosopher and cultivated men towards the hand-workers was much the same as that of the Jewish scribes and doctors towards those who knew not the law ; they did not regard them as capable of the higher education, or the nobler kind of virtue, and they were content that it should be so. The ideal city, with such men as this, was one in which no citizen was a mechanic or engaged in any mean trade.

The religion of the carpenter, the fishermen, the tent-maker, has changed all this. The city which hath the true foundations, whose Architect and Maker is God, opens its impartial gates alike to all—to the brain worker and the hard worker, to the student and the labourer, to the high-born and the low-born. All these may claim their franchise in the kingdom of God. It is a most significant fact that the very first Apostolical Epistles —for the two Epistles to the Thessalonians are the earliest of all the writings of the New Testament— speak out so earnestly on the dignity of labour the nobleness of working with one's hands, the duty of preferring one's own bread, won in the sweat of our face, to daintier food won as a beggar or a parasite. When St. Paul, speaking to the Ephesian elders on the sea-shore, stretched forth his hands, most likely marked and stained with his worked, and said, "Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities and to them that were with me," a new era was dawning on the world ; the era in which it came to be recognised —slowly indeed, and against many prejudices— that we are all one Body in Christ ; that in one Spirit we were all baptised into one Body, and that every part of the Body, so long as it discharges its appropriate service for the good of the whole, is worthy of honour.

In what I have said, I do not of course mean that hand-labour is the only worthy kind of labour, as some appear to think. Far from it. The labour of the brain is harder and more exhausting than the work of the hand, and, even in a material sense, the great inventors and organisers of labour have been the cause of the prosperity of the country ; but the poet, the orator, the historian, the philosopher, the lawyer, the physician, the religious teacher, have had their mead of praise in all ages ; it was nothing new that they should be honoured. What I wish to point out is, that it was new to the Greeks of St. Paul's time, though it would not have been to the Romans of an earlier time, to be told that hand-labour had also its own honour, and that living on the earnings of others, without necessity, should be held in scorn. This latter precept was evidently very necessary in the early Church. For the duty and the blessedness of giving were so strongly inculcated, that it was necessary to insist very strongly, on the other hand, on the nobleness and blessedness of earning one's own living. There was no doubt a danger that the weaker members of the Church might be demoralised and made yet weaker by the almsgiving of the stronger. St. Paul wished to administer a sharp corrective.

In one way or other work is the duty of man, and it is also his happiness. "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," was the doom of man: it is also his consolation. By "work" I mean power exerted—power whether of body or mind—to attain some useful end. In this, and not in idleness, man's happiness is found. Rest and amusement was necessary to permit the repair of our exhausted frames, but it is work that makes rest sweet, and amusement innocent and enjoyable. Those who are not compelled to work in order to live must either find work or live a life which is aimless, and therefore miserable. The sense of progress by the expenditure of our force towards some end which we much desire is the highest happiness.

And this end which we most desire ought to be the highest end of all, our highest good or blessedness, in the knowledge of God in Christ. God worketh hitherto, and Christ worketh. God is the only real power in the world; all other things which men regard as power, and perhaps venerate over much, are but shadows destined to vanish before the great reality. The great Power which regulates and keeps in order the moral and spiritual world, as well as the material world, is God; God who worketh in us both to will and to work. Therefore work out your own salvation, trembling at the mighty presence of Him who is with you. Don't cease from working, because God is with you; *work* because God is with you, Who only can enable you to work to good effect. Don't walk disorderly, in a wild, undisciplined way, vainly setting yourselves against God's order. Work in accordance with God's order, with God, helped by God. In this way shall your work be done.

This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent. In order to work you must have faith; without faith it is impossible to please God. With faith and love in the heart the man is drawn forward by a kind of natural attraction in the way in which he should go. And yet at the best we shall have to say at the end, even if we have done all that was commanded us—and who has? Lord, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do—no more. One Man only has the world seen who, when He drew near the end of His earthly course, was able to say, "I have glorified Thee on earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do." Through the merits of His perfected work may we be accepted with God.

THE Bishop of Chester, speaking at Warrington on the 18th inst., said that if the Government continued to treat the Church as it had done with regard to the Tithes Bill it would lose the confidence of many of its warmest friends. It was the duty of Ministers to protect the rights of the clergy, and especially those of their Welsh brethren.

FAITH NECESSARY AND SUPERNATURAL.

BY THE REV. CHARLES GORE, M.A., LIBRARIAN OF THE PUSEY MEMORIAL HOUSE, OXFORD, EDITOR OF "LUX MUNDI."

SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY ON ST. PETER'S DAY.

"Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven."—ST. MATT. xvi. 17.

TWO truths lie upon the surface of this narrative so plain that he that runs may read: the first is, the importance attached by our Lord to faith in Himself; and the other, the supernatural character of such faith.

The importance attached by our Lord to faith in Himself—for here there comes to the surface the end for which He had separated and was training the twelve. It was that they might gain a firm and unqualified faith in Himself; that they might learn to confess His name. He had looked steadily at humanity when it made its first offer of service; He had seen the shifty, unstable character of its enthusiasms; the secret taint of sin and selfishness which marred its high endeavours, and deliberately He had refused to commit Himself and His cause to such advocacy:—

"When He was in Jerusalem, at the Passover . . . . many believed in His name, when they saw the miracles which He did; but Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man" (John ii. 23-25).

It was not that He distrusted the capacity of man for highest ends. On the contrary, He was come to bring men back into union with God, and make them fellow-workers with Him. But He distrusted human nature *as He found it.* He knew, to start with, that sad secret which, in slow and embittering experience, has turned enthusiasts into cynics and made philanthropists mad—the sad secret of human untrustworthiness. He knew it, and because He knew it He could not build the spiritual fabric of His kingdom upon the shifting sand of unregenerate human nature. "Except ye be converted, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

Humanity must make a fresh start, and that fresh start from Himself. "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me." "I am the Way." "I am come that they might have life." "Come unto Me." If they would be really restored, redeemed, set right, they must look away from all else and be content to follow Him; and not merely to follow Him, but to believe in Him; to contemplate Him till they understood the meaning of His mission, the secret of His Person; till behind the human Leader and Friend and Son of Man they discerned

the Christ, the Son of God, their Lord and their God.

Thus, to create this faith in Himself, He turns from the crowd and separates the twelve—that little band who will stand the preliminary test of obedience, and consent to forsake all and follow Him; these He takes to be with Him; these He trains into unreserved belief in His Person, so that in these He can find a firm nucleus for a permanent work; the solid core of a regenerate humanity. He trains them by intercourse with Himself. Thus He lets them feel gradually the authority of His words, the absolute claim, the claim of very God, which He makes and presses upon the consciences and wills of men; He lets them see His works, the life-giving power which inheres in Him and flows forth from Him; that power which is only the expression of the same Self as finds utterance in His teaching, the same expression only now in the outward act, now in the spoken word. And in fact the authoritative words of our Lord, and His life-giving deeds, carrying with them intimations so unmistakable of a presence more than human, these gradually, silently, take possession of the Apostles' minds; they pass from love and admiration into awe and worship. Behind the manhood they begin to discern the Godhead. This dawning conviction is disciplined by apparent failure. Our Lord becomes unpopular with all classes; His words offend. Many of His disciples go back and walk no more with Him. Then it is that our Lord by questioning the little band of the twelve seeks to elicit from them the explicit confession of His Name. It was in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi—a place the very name of which, recalling as it did the foreign dominion of Cæsar, had a depressing sound to the natural hopes and aspirations of patriotic Jews—it was here that He draws out from them the expression of a faith and hope which welled up from springs deeper than mere nationalism, deeper than anything which was contained within the compass of their own natures. "Whom do men say that I am?" He asked first. They give Him the various rumours that were abroad, as that He was John the Baptist, or Elias, or one of the Prophets; and He makes no comment. The outer world might speak of Him vaguely as something wonderful and extraordinary, without caring to examine more closely into His claims.

But of them who were to constitute His Church an exacter knowledge is required. He presses the question closer home, "Whom do ye say that I am?" And silence falls on the little band, for it is hard to put into words a struggling and half-formed conviction. But a conviction to gain reality must dare to utter itself. St. Peter obeys the promptings of the Spirit, which all were secretly acknowledging. "Thou art the Christ," he cries, "the Son of the living God." This is what our Lord had wanted—this is what He was waiting for. He fixes, He stereotypes this bold confession with His emphatic benediction:—"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonah" . . . . "and I say unto thee," in virtue of this thy bold confession, "that thou art Peter," Rock man: the confession of My name turns the shifting sand of humanity into solid rock; "upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."*

Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonah. Blessed art thou, for faith in Jesus Christ is the one necessity of man's redemption. Blessed art thou, because this fundamental act of faith is not of thyself, or of anything visible or tangible, or merely human; "flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father, which is in heaven." It was not that our Lord despised flesh and blood. Nay, why should He in that case have taken it? But as on another occasion He says "the flesh profiteth nothing" (John vi. 63), meaning the bare flesh, the flesh of itself, so now He means that humanity of itself can never discover God, or find Him out. The recognition of God must always be God's own disclosure of Himself in the heart of man. So it is in conscience. We do not discover God, but He makes Himself felt. So it is further on, in the recognition of God incarnate in Jesus Christ. He *is* incarnate, He has really taken flesh and blood—"Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise partook of the same." (Heb. ii. 14.) In flesh He showed Himself. As man he dwelt with man. It was through the experience of His true manhood that the twelve became conscious of His Godhead. Through flesh and blood they knew Him, and in the same flesh and blood they were to have eternal fellowship with Him. His flesh was to be their meat, His blood to be their drink. Yet nothing that flesh and blood could do would ever amount to either imparting life or creating conviction. If, on His part, His flesh and blood are life-giving, that is because they are not mere flesh and blood, but something more, "spirit and life," "quickening spirit" (John vi. 63, 1 Cor. xv. 45, 50). If, on their part, the reflections, the reasonings, the intuitions of human nature can amount to the real conviction of faith that must be because there is something diviner working behind and in their manhood. Miracles of themselves cannot convince: reasonings of themselves cannot convince. None of these "evidences" can create faith. "No man can come unto Me, except the Father which hath sent Me draw him" (John vi. 44). Faith always must be a Divine gift, God's disclosure of Himself. "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven."

We pass a stage downwards in Church history—still we find the Apostles teaching the same lesson of faith which they had themselves learned. Everything, according to St. Paul, depends on faith.

* See H. S. Holland, "Creed and Character," "The Rock of the Church."

The salvation which the Church has to offer it offers on the terms of faith and on none other. It is not that the Church presumes to limit God's freedom of working where He will, and revealing Himself in His own time and way to every soul which, however blindly and ignorantly, seeks Him. There is no final rejection of a soul we know, except because it obstinately and finally refuses the light and loves the darkness (John iii. 19). But the Church has a Gospel to proclaim, an offer of God to publish; and this offer, this covenant of salvation is made on no other terms than those of faith, faith real and conscious in the person of Christ, a faith which is able to express itself in propositions. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom. x. 9.)

Here is the necessity for faith which Christ taught His Apostles, and the Apostles proclaimed to the world, and the Church can never let that utterance die or diminish aught of its peremptory claim. "Dost thou believe that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God?" So the Church must always cross-question her catechumens at the gate of baptism. Dost thou believe Him incarnate, crucified, risen glorified, the Judge of all? If so, thou hast the secret of salvation. Thou, too, canst "fall into the ranks of that mighty movement of redeemed humanity which as it traverses the ages follows the uplifted banner of the Cross, and when it would sing its hymn of human progress recites instinctively the Creed of the Apostles."*

St. Paul, like his Master, asserts the necessity of faith, and he asserts also its supernatural character. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. xii. 3). It is the same truth that we learned from our Lord. In the Apostolic age, in place of Christ's miracles and words, there is the Apostolic witness, firm and unhesitating and unanimous, that they had seen the risen Lord; there is the simple strength of the Apostolic teaching, the record of what they heard and saw and handled of the Word of Life; there is the evidence of miracles still amongst men; there is the moral argument of souls converted and sins forgiven and lives sanctified. But not all these taken together can produce faith, not faith in St. Paul's sense; over and above these, and giving the meaning to these, must be the inner movement of God's good Spirit in the heart of man—an inner movement welcomed and acted upon, so that it takes effect in the courage of self-committal, the courageous profession of Christ's name. No man can really profess His Name: "no man," in real knowledge of what the words mean, "can say 'Jesus is Lord,' but by the Holy Ghost."

The necessity for faith; its supernatural character—these old lessons are what we again and again must learn and relearn and lay to heart.

1. FAITH IS NECESSARY IF WE WOULD SHARE THE CHRISTIAN HOPE AND LIFE.—What genuineness there is in Thomas Carlyle's protest against the attempts to sustain the fainting courage of men by an unreal appeal to Christian language emptied of its meaning. They would have comforted him after his wife's death by the vaguely-used phrase, "In my Father's house are many mansions." "Yes," he said, 'if you were God you may have a right to say so; if you are man what do you know more than I or any of us?" In very truth Jesus hath brought life and immortality to light; He has raised a dim hope of immortality into a certain expectation, a secure conviction; so that eternity becomes the recognised scale on which we are to calculate our life, and to estimate what is and what is not worth doing. But He has done this only because as manifested Son of God He reveals with secure knowledge the things of eternity, and because as Son of Man, the revealer of manhood's true capacity and destiny, He was Himself raised from the dead to die no more. "If Christ be not raised your hope is vain." Again, we may be thankful to find one who, like John Stuart Mill, did not share our Christian faith, recognising that not "even now would it be easy even for an unbeliever to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete than to endeavour so to live that Christ would approve his life." But we cannot but see that logically such acceptance of Christ as the final standard of human action is only possible if indeed we believe that "by this Man God will judge the world." (Acts xvii. 31.) It cannot, in fact, be too clearly understood that the consolations of Christianity have their root in a definite faith about His Person. We believe that God is love, not because the evidence of nature is enough to support that peculiarly Christian belief, but because we confess that Christ is in such true sense the Son of God, that His character is the character of God, His love the love of God. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." We believe in the forgiveness of sins; that the Son of man not only had, but still hath in His Church "the power on earth to forgive sins" (Luke v. 24). But the security of absolution really depends on the absolving will being the final and absolute will; the absolving sentence, the Divine sentence: "Who can forgive sins," we say still, "but God alone?" (Luke v. 21).

There is no doubt about it, the Christian consolations depend on the Christian faith, and the consolations have not the strength to bear the rough usage of life, they are not adequate to sustain us through the strain of its experiences till the faith on which they rest is a faith which is brave and free enough to come out into the light of common profession and common intercourse, to be formu-

* H. P. Liddon. "University Sermons," Vol. I., Ed. iv., p. 52.

lated in propositions, and be made the basis of action and policy, as in the simple language of the Christian Creed, the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation.

2. FAITH IS NECESSARY AND FAITH IS SUPERNATURAL.—It is the gift of God, that is to say, not the result of the mere action of our own faculties. It is only to say this in other words to assert that faith can never be produced by "evidences" and "proofs." Such evidences can justify faith and support it and show it to be rational; they cannot produce it. Such evidences we have in our generations in quite fresh force and power. For our New Testament documents have passed through a critical sifting and analysis of the most trenchant and thorough sort in the fifty years that lie behind us. From such sifting we have learned much about the process through which our New Testament documents took their present shape. But in all that is material we feel that critical investigation has only reassured us in asserting the historical truth of the records on which our Christian faith rests. I may express this in two ways:—

First, by saying that critical investigation enables us to assert with better grounds of assurance than ever that the Christ of our Four Gospels, the miraculous Christ, the Christ with His absolute, Divine claim, is the original Christ of history, as those beheld Him and bore witness who had been educated in closest intercourse with Him.* We have better grounds of assurance than ever that we have in our Four Gospels no late and vague tradition, but the "Apostles' doctrine." We have better grounds of assurance than ever that we have in St. Paul's Epistles clear and unmistakable witness to "what the first Christians thought about Christ."

Secondly, the sifting of recent criticism enables us to call attention with fresh emphasis to the trustworthy character of the Apostolic testimony. In some ages testimony has been careless—so careless, so clouded with superstitious credulity, as to be practically valueless. But in the Apostles we have men who knew thoroughly the value of testimony, and what depended on it; who bore witness to what they had seen, and (in all cases except the exceptional case of St. Paul) to what they had seen over a prolonged period of years; whose conviction about Christ had been gradually formed, in spite of much "slowness of heart," and even persistent "unbelief;" formed also in the face of Sadducean scepticism and in the full consciousness of what would be said against them; formed into such irresistible strength and unanimity by the solid impress of facts that nothing could shake it in individuals or in the body. Such testimony does all for us that testimony can do. We can be sure, then, that the Christ of our Gospels is the Christ of history and fact. We can allow His claim and character, as it is presented to us in our Gospels, to make its full impression on us. We can place ourselves at His feet, like the first disciples, and hear His words. We shall find ourselves driven to admit that He makes upon us the claim which none can make but He who created and rules our souls. We shall find in His miracles works which express in another sphere exactly the same claim as finds utterance in His language—the same authority of love and judgment. We shall realise how such a character and claim and life leads up naturally to His Resurrection; how such an issue is required by a life of such a character. So He will be "marked out" for us, as for the Apostles, "as the Son of God in power, according to a spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4). All this evidence can do for us. It can impress, it can awe us; it can suggest faith and justify it and make it reasonable. But create it it cannot. "No man can say Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost." At the last resort it is by an act of faith only that we can "set to our seal" that God's offer in Christ is true (John iii. 33); and this act, this venture of faith, this going out of ourselves in loving surrender, is always a motion which we know to have its origin far beyond us; it comes as a movement from above, a movement in us of the Divine Spirit. In making our act of faith we are not, we know, originating, but only corresponding, and corresponding to none other than God, the Holy Spirit. It is by the Spirit only that we can recognise the Son, and it is in the Son only that we can recognise the Father.

3. One word more and I have done. There are two sorts of faith. There is a faith by which we come to believe, and the faith in which as Christians we live. Both are supernatural, both, that is to say, are the work of God in us, though they correspond to different stages of the Holy Spirit's activity. For He works upon men to make them Christians, and He dwells, as in a temple, in the heart of him who is already a Christian. Thus working upon men He brings them to belief, dwelling within them He sustains them in that highest sort of faith, both "habitual" and "actual," which is the consciousness of sonship. "God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15). This life of faith, this consciousness of sonship, is meant to be the normal life of the Christian. And yet, if even the Eternal Son in our manhood vouchsafed to enter so deep into the trials of the human spirit, as to lose the enjoyment of the Divine Fellowship, the conscious illumination of the Father's Presence, and to cry "My God, My God, why hast

* "Cf. The Composition of the Four Gospels," by the Rev. A. Wright (Macmillan, 1890), p. 95, "If modern research has established anything it has established the priority of the first cycle [*i. e.*, the evangelic narrative as represented in St. Mark], and the earliest part of the first cycle would undoubtedly be that which most demands a belief in the supernatural."

Thou forsaken Me?" surely we, too, must expect trials in our spiritual life. How much the more so, that in ourselves we have to deal not only with the weaknesses which belong to innocence, but with that obscuring of the things of faith which results inevitably from worldliness and indolence and impurity. Yes, depend upon it, we shall not find it always easy to keep up the life of faith, to "endure as seeing Him who is invisible" (Heb. xi. 27). Always we need to remember that, as the creation, so the sustaining, of the life of faith is a Divine gift, and demands on our part a reverent waiting upon the gifts of the Divine Spirit. "Lord, I believe, help Thou my unbelief."

THE annual festival of the Llandaff Diocesan Lay Helpers' Association was held at Llandaff Cathedral on the 10th inst., and was largely attended. At 11.30 there was Holy Communion, at which the Bishop officiated. An address on Christian worship was given by the Rev. M. E. Welby. In the afternoon, a well-attended conference of clergy and laity was held in the Prebendal House, under the presidency of the Bishop, who addressed the conference on the importance of lay work in the Church, and suggested as a subject for consideration "The Best Means of Promoting the Work of the Association."

IT is not generally known, says the *Church Review*, how the late Rev. Thomas Helmore suffered for conscience' sake. "He held some extra post at one of the Chapels Royal, the exact nature of which we cannot now remember, but it meant the performance of clerical duties for absent officials, and a stipend of about £100 a year was attached to it. The duties necessitated his celebrating the Eucharist at times. Mr. Helmore always adopted the position 'before the altar,' which is not thought extraordinary nowadays, but was considered very alarming then. The Bishop of London of the period, who was *ex officio* Dean of the Chapels Royal, required him to abstain from this practice. Mr. Helmore was unable conscientiously to agree to this, and in consequence was deprived of the office and its emoluments.'

THE Bishop of Bedford, upon the invitation of Canon Edgar Jacob, and the vicars of St. Jude's, Southsea, and St. James's, Milton, has been preaching and speaking in the neighbourhood of Portsmouth on behalf of the East London Church Fund. On Saturday, the 12th, an afternoon meeting, arranged by the Rev. H. Egremont, late vicar of All Saints', Clapton-park, was, by reason of the weather, held in St. James's Church, Milton, instead of in the open air. Upon the following day sermons were preached in the magnificent parish church of Portsea; St. Jude's, Southsea; and St. Columba's, Eastney, by the Bishop of Bedford and the secretary of the East London Church Fund, the afternoon congregations of children being especially striking, there being 2,000 children assembled in St. Mary's, Portsea, and the festival of the Ministering Children's League being held in St. Jude's, Southsea. The sermons were followed up by two meetings on Monday the 14th, in Portsea and Southsea, in the evening and afternoon respectively. Such practical sympathy must be especially acceptable to the Bishop and his council at a time when the income of the fund is £700 less and the expenses, by reason of new grants made, are necessarily £1,000 more than they were at the same date in last year.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of pap be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to M r. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office 16 c, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1890.

STRIVING TOGETHER.

ALTHOUGH appeals to cultivate unity may be pressed home, the causes inciting to the opposite are often too strong to be vanquished by argument. Only consequences irreparable proclaim the evils of want of concord, but when too late for good to come. The Church of England is rent with factions, and more like a ship seized by mutineers, than anything else. Are all but the mutineers, now almost masters of the situation, still to eye one another with jealousy, still to feed fanatical grudges that were founded on bygone discords—discords originally insensate—fomented by the Romanist emissaries, and that ought now be obsolete? If anyone comes forth as a brave defender, his first assailant is sure to be another brave defender, who differs on some question about mere "goat's wool," and drives at him incontinently when he does not aspirate the Protestant "Shibboleth" exactly as he does himself. If one could hope for any attention to the lessons of history, many telling appeals are here to be found. In the siege of Jerusalem, this fierce individuality and implacable Sectarianism contributed largely to the fall of the doomed city. In military records, the army that changes front in face of an enemy, how many times has it brought defeat on itself by this perilous manœuvre? Another lesson is full of instruction, and especially as the graduated exhibitions are so clearly marked in the results attained. Thus, when the attempt of the Stuarts to Romanize England in Church and State grew rife, we find three distinct positions taken up with corresponding results. First, a section of the English, as a section, broke out into wild rage and, to the vast delight of the Romanizers, exhibited the shocking

finale of regicide ferocity. The second movement was not quite so infuriate. When the Church and Monarchy "got their innings," a rather spiteful retaliation was exhibited and a deplorable lack of Christian charity prevailed. And it was only, thirdly, in the time of James II. that the elements of English social, political and religious life, merged into harmonious concord, and accordingly came safe out of the ordeal. Men then forgot their petty quarrels and buried their sharp hatchets. Inside the Church, party-spirit ceased, faction died out. Outside the Church, as John Bunyan relates, the Dissenters spurned the special boons prepared for their own special advancement to the prejudice of the general interest of the Protestant cause. And all joined to a man to oppose the insidious tyranny that sought the mastery. If all this culminated at Derry and the Boyne just two hundred years ago, why note the glorious interposition of Providence then exhibited without also noting the gracious brotherhood which Providence crowned with success. Is it not well then to look back in this present crisis, when the disruption of the kingdom and the corruption of the Church are being compassed, and take the lessons so forcibly taught? Are we only to follow our ancestors in the *exemplar vitris imitabile?* Are we not rather to copy that fidelity to God and that mutual forbearance which were the very basis of their deliverance? To hear one set of those who now call themselves "Protestants" cry out "Calvinist," and another answer with "Arminian," is deplorable. To "strive together for the hope of the Gospel" with success begins with ceasing to strive *with one another*. This is the grand lesson of Christian ethics and English history. This lesson is not to be set aside by minor issues at bye-elections. Theory and practice concur in the demonstration. And when Liberals and Conservatives can unite to save the unity of th ekingdom, why cannot Churchmen and Dissen ers unite to save the Protestant faith and with it the freedom of England? Those who act otherwise only subserve the cause of tyranny and anarchy and make themselves the tools of the Papacy.

P. D.

OVERCROWDED CEMETERIES. — The Rev. F. Lawrence, Hon. Secretary of the Church of England Burial, Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, preaching in Manchester Cathedral, said that the desire for costly and ostentatious funerals was largely the source of the practice of excessive insurance of infants' lives, which was taken advantage of by unprincipled parents, and was thus indirectly responsible for the infanticide against which the Bishop of Peterborough's Bill was directed. Burial in vaults, and what is known as pit-burial, constituted—the preacher said—a public scandal. The Association was urging the Government to concentrate in the Local Government Board the control over burial-places now divided between that Board and the Home Office with a view to the better administration of existing laws.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

A YEAR WITH THE GERMAN REEDS.

SIR,—I do not wonder that the writer of the articles under the above heading should be taken to task. The wonder ought to be that the said articles were allowed to go unchallenged. The point is difficult to settle how much, and of what sort, should be the recreation which the Christian needs? It is not so with the duties of a religious paper. These are well defined and very clear. They are to set forth the claims of religion. The teachers, whose lives are set forth in Scripture, are the models. They have nothing to say of pleasure, save only to condemn it. This much is quite plain.

The German Reed amusements may be innocent enough. The principal element in those amusements, according to the writer's own showing, is that of ridiculing the foibles of the various sections of humanity. The art, if art it may be called, that caters for the amusement, is that of mimicing what others do, particularly when their ideals are not on all fours with those who take upon them to mimic them. The amusement then consists in holding foibles up to ridicule, the art that of reproducing what one observes in others. I say the amusement may be innocent, but it certainly is not elevating. The art . . . well, is it an art? Or, if it be an art, is it of the highest kind? All this apart, I submit the question, Is it becoming in a religious paper to advocate its claims?

The Bishop of this diocese once held a Conference. The subject of debate was, "How to promote the amusements of the people?" I went, but refrain from speaking about my feelings there. I wrote to the vicar of the Church, in connection with which the Conference was held, to ask his opinion of it all. He replied, "Never was anything better." My answer was, "I am sorry to hear you say so. What would you think of the Apostles meeting in solemn conclave to devise what would be the best means of amusing perishing souls?" It is, in my opinion, the last thing a religious teacher should think of to provide amusement.

"I have," continues the writer, "derived many hours of welcome recreation from them at a time of much sorrow of heart and vexation of spirit." May I ask him, Did he pray for a blessing? And did he thank God for it? And was the blessing real? Was it lasting? How much has it deepened his devotion, strengthened his faith, enlarged his hope, intensified his love? In what particulars has it enlarged and strengthened the Christian virtues?

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, July 19, 1890.

A PROTEST.

SIR,—I must really intervene in your valued columns in a perfectly friendly manner. I protest *most strongly* against the style and tone of the letter signed "Edmund Lawrence" in your last number. I think that your correspondent, the Rev. C. Crosthwaite, expresses his opinions candidly and honestly.

His arguments should be met in an honourable and gentlemanly way. Personalities and abuse should always be avoided as highly objectionable. I am an old-fashioned Churchman, I love peace and order, and I can tolerate various opinions, but let them be stated with charity and humility.

BARTHOLOMEW SPRING, LL.D.

Lausanne.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—In the current PULPIT, Mr. Murphy writes: "To say that the first chapter of Genesis contradicts evolution is as absurd as to say that it contradicts the high antiquity of the earth."

How so? The "high antiquity" of the earth is distinctly affirmed in the very first verse, which tells us that the earth (coeval with the heavens) was created "in the beginning" (Gen. i. 1). It would surely be difficult to reach a much higher antiquity than "the beginning." That the first chapter of Genesis does distinctly, emphatically (one might say providentially) contradict evolution as a general theory explaining the Universe, I have already sufficientfy demonstrated; and, as I know full well how impossible it is to convince anyone against his will, I abstain from repeating what has been already set forth. If further argument were needed, it might be found in the next chapter: "And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but *for Adam there was not found an help meet for him*" (Gen. ii. 20). Not any help meet for man to be found among all the products of evolution in a world teeming with life! Among all the highly developed descendants of his primitive "hairy quadrumanous ancestor," who was "probably furnished with a tail and pointed ears," and "arboreal in his habits," not one is to be found "fit to hold a candle to" Adam! Of course not. How could the material—that which is of the earth, earthy—possibly produce any fitting counterpart of the spiritual and the godlike?

Whether the first chapter of Genesis be, as Mr. Murphy pronounces it to be, "a philosophical poem" or not, one thing is certain—namely, that it has been of more practical use to mankind than all poems and all philosophies. For it helped to keep the devout Jew (who was the moral granite of the ancient world) erect and enlightened, free from that degrading Nature-worship by which gifted Greek and resistless Roman were both enslaved. How wholly they were "given over to a reprobate mind" the *graffiti* of Pompeii testify. "Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible . . . into an image made like to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things," and "changed the truth of GOD into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." How St. Paul has, in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, for ever exposed and gibbeted the falseness and foulness of ancient Paganism! What would the world have been to-day without the Jew—left only to the tender mercies of the civilised and intellectual, but benighted and corrupted, Greek and Roman?

It was the earnest Jew, with his sacred Scriptures (beginning with the first chapter of Genesis) who was the chief instrument in that moral reformation—that spiritual resurrection—of the lost and dead heathen world which marks the first Christian century.

The scientist will never do one-half for the good of mankind that the despised Jew has already done; nor will evolution ever reveal to man his proper place in Creation more clearly than he has been taught it for thousands of years in the opening words of the Bible.

H. HEBER EVANS.

July 17th, 1890.

DR. BEHREND'S SERMON.

SIR,—May I ask the learned preacher to explain these words at p. 29 of his sermon?

"A historic episcopate, for example, is an illogical compromise, and an impossible condition to Christian catholicity. Its antiquity may be admitted, its beneficent historical influence may be granted, but it can never be made binding, unless the Acts and the Epistles disclose its Apostolic institution." I ask, does not Dr. Behrend recognise the Epistles to Timothy and Titus as inspired? Does not St. Paul make Timothy the source of orders, rule, judgment, promotion, etc.? Does he not direct Titus to ordain in every city? Bishop Lightfoot acknowledges that resident Episcopacy was established before St. John died. Is not this the "Apostolic institution" that Dr. Behrend demands?

"Evident unto all men . . . from the Apostles' time."
—Preface to Ordinal.

C. C.

PROTESTANTISM AND INFIDELITY.

SIR,—In the *Catholic News*, of June 28th, we are informed that a sermon was delivered lately in the Church of St. Mary, Wigan, the clergyman preaching on the subject of "Private Judgment," upon which a correspondent, "Latris," remarks:—"The only line that could be taken for the purpose of answering him"—that is the preacher—"would have been to show some principle which allows private judgment to Protestants, but denies it to infidels; the only alternative that occurs to me is to acknowledge that infidelity is nothing but one form of Protestantism." I would much desire that "Latris" would enter into particulars to prove his words and then he might discover that Protestantism is something better than what he represents it to be. So far from Protestantism depending upon mere individual opinion it leads up to history, and therefore Protestants to be true to their principles have to conform to what is there related. For instance, in the beginning of our race appearing upon the earth, they were depending upon the commands of their Maker to insure their well-being. As people increased in number the law of God was delivered not merely to a few persons that they might keep it to themselves and then command and judge the rest of the people. If we read at Deut. xxxi. 9 we shall find that the law from God became a written law, and that it had to be read to all alike within the nation, to men, women, and children, and the strangers, that they all might learn to fear the Lord their God. Here we find that all the people, young and old, had to be acquainted with the law of God for themselves; the question with them, as with our race in the present day, was not one of private judgment but of obedience, for we may be sure that when the people with the

children were commanded to learn God's law that it was written in such a manner that they could understand it. By each one learning it they were in a good position to guard against false teachers, and had this rule been carefully observed, the history of the Israelities might have been very different to the one of great calamity which came upon them. Joshua, like Moses, was a good servant of God, and we learn by Joshua viii. 35 that he too read the law of God before all the congregation. We do not find by Bible history that Joshua and the priests and Levites had any commands from the Lord apart from what all the people had to know and understand. We also find by Dan. ix. 13 that it was this law of Moses that directed the life of Daniel, and this is what made him the good man he was. In this passage of Scripture he plainly tells us that evil came upon the people, "As it is written in the law of Moses." We do not read in Bible history of any Church existing in the time of Moses, Joshua and Daniel for God's people to obey apart from the law which Moses wrote and read for the guidance of the congregation of the Lord. And now let us see what is recorded in the New Testament as to any Church authority existing apart from what the Old Testament contains, or whether there is any evidence to prove that the Old Testament was received by anyone in particular for its preserva- as I understand "Latris" to state it was, or whether the Scriptures were for all alike to read at their pleasure (2 Thess. iii. 1). As to the Holy Scriptures being a sufficient rule of faith, let us observe how our Saviour referred to them. In His temptation described in Matt. iv. He defended Himself against the attacks of the devil by referring to scripture, teaching us all that if we obey its words we are preserved in safety from evil. And then again, He said they cannot be broken, showing that what they declared had to be fulfilled. And some, who were Sadducees, were told by Him, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." What an impressive lesson for the nations of our earth that they should understand the necessity of knowing them that they may exist in a state of peace and true prosperity. In fact, we may truly say that our Lord's ministry was one teaching from the Scriptures to lead our race into obedience to God. Let us particularly notice the words at Luke xxiv. 27, "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." And now I will refer briefly to the testimony contained in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles which follow it. In Acts vi. 4, we find it written that the Apostles gave themselves "continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word." And let us notice how Philip led the eunuch to the Scriptures, and how he went on his way rejoicing after Philip's explanation upon them. Let us observe St. Paul's words at 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, teaching us that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and rose again according to them. And at Acts xxvi. we are informed that St. Paul in his ministry of the gospel depended on the Scriptures "saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." In my referring to private judgment I do not think I can do better than bring attention to St. Paul's words at 1 Cor. ii.-14, "But the natural man receives not the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." According to this, man's own interpretation can never enable him to understand the plan of salvation. There must be a leaving of himself and a searching after the things of God before he can come to a right judgment on eternal things. Our Lord has explained all this. He tells us, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shal l ask the Father in My name, He will give it you"—John xvi. 23. By our praying to God according to His holy word His good spirit comes to us to guide us in the way of divine truth, and then we are able to do what is pleasing to God. Before concluding this letter, I desire to bring attention to a proposition reported in the *Catholic News* of June 21st, to have been made by Cardinal Manning in a pastoral on education in Roman Catholic schools. He said, "There are four classes of persons who ought to contribute to it. First, the Government. . . ." Only imagine, Protestants giving assistance to train up children to believe that infidelity is but one form of Protestantism, and that its followers are infidels and heretics.

J. T. DOCKER.

Bognor, July, 1890.

ALTAR LIGHTS—THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words in reference to an utterance of Canon Carter, at Prince's Hall, on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday?

His words are: "Suppose that the judgment should be unfavourable to altar lights, would it not certainly be generally held, if this were the case, that the Real Presence was condemned?" Canon Carter here confounds a corporal adorable presence with a Real Presence of grace and spirit, as Ridley distinguished them at his trial—Altar lights, I thought, only witnessed that Christ, in His two-fold nature, is the light of the world. If they are declared now illegal for fear of Popery, Christ's title to be the light of the world is not shaken nor impugned, neither is the truth that His Body is present by grace or influence. If those who hold a material adorable presence—declared by the Church to be impossible—if such persons regard the prohibition of altar lights a denial of that doctrine, very well! let them so consider it. But it is no denial of a Real Presence of grace, of which the bread broken is, according to St. Paul, the means of conveyance, or, at least, of partaking among ourselves—the Church rules it that Christ's Body, though spiritual, is still a natural Body, confined to one place at a time. If it is present only spiritually, as opposed to materially, this must mean by influence or effects, and not by actual contact, as the sun and moon are present by attraction, etc. This may well agree with the words, "His Body present under the veil of bread and wine," and the other of the Homilies, "Under the form of bread and wine." These are perfectly innocent terms, if the Body of our Lord is present in a way consistent with its being confined to heaven alone, which is the only sense the Prayer Book does not condemn. I saw it lately stated that it is only a material substance that can be under a veil. But this is unreasonable. Does not grace accompany the waters of Baptism, and the bread of the Eucharist? May not a means of conveyance be innocently called a veil, or form? When the woman by touch of His garment received health, might it not be said that health came to her under the veil or form of His garment? Why, then, did not the same garment convey health to all? In the same way it is asked why

the bread does not convey a blessing to the impenitent? These questions may seem hard; but it might just as well be asked, why do not sermons and advice benefit all, though designed for all? If we do not like the *ponere obicem* theory let us invent another, or wait till the bright light of another world makes all mysteries plain.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Canon and V.-G. of Kildare.

ATTEMPTS TO CLEAR THE ATMOSPHERE.

SIR,—It seems to me a very desirable object to establish the truth in regard to the history of dogmas. I have always understood the party called orthodox to assert that the doctrine of eternal punishment has been held from the earliest centuries of Christianity, having been inculcated from the first by intelligent and pious teachers, and reverentially accepted by the masses. The orthodox writers never hint, as far as I have seen, that physical force and severe penalties were employed to prevent open intellectual opposition.

Dr. Pusey says, in "What is of Faith," that "no one has yet been found to doubt that the mass of Christians have from the first believed the future punishment of the lost to be everlasting."

It appears to me, as far as my limited researches enable me to judge, that the Augustinian theology was enforced on the Church by the interference of the civil powers. I will quote some passages from Milman's "Latin Christianity," vol. i., book ii., chap. ii.: "The African bishops inflexibly adhered to the condemnation of Pelagius, of Celestius and their doctrines . . . . . Augustine and the African bishops had summoned to their aid a more powerful ally than even the Bishop of Rome. While the Pope (Zosimus) either still adhered to the cause of Pelagius, or but began to vacillate, an Imperial edict was issued from the Court of Ravenna, peremptorily deciding on this abstruse question of theology . . . . . There can be no doubt that the law was obtained by the influence of the African bishops, with the Emperor or his ministers; there is great likelihood by the personal authority of Augustine with the Count Valerius. . . . . In the order issued by the Prætorian Prefects of Italy and the East, not merely were the heresiarchs banished, but their accomplices condemned to the confiscation of their estates, and to perpetual exile . . . . . Justly might Julianus taunt his ecclesiastical brethren with this attempt to crush their adversaries by the civil power. With shame and sorrow we hear from Augustine himself, that fatal axiom, which for centuries reconciled the best and holiest men to the guilt of persecution, the axiom which impiously arrayed cruelty in the garb of Christian Charity, that they were persecuted in compassion to their souls." Augustine also said, "The Christian powers (that is, civil powers) are bound to use *disciplinam coercitionis* against all opponents of the Catholic faith." Milman adds a little further on: "The West in general bowed before the commanding authority of Augustine . . . . hesitated not to abandon the whole world external to the Church to that inevitable hell, which was the patrimony of all the children of Adam." He also says that one of the consequences of those gloomy tenets was the establishment of a strong sacerdotal system which "reconciled Christendom with the Augustinian theology." The belief instilled into the multitude, that "through the Church alone man could be secure of that direct agency of God upon his soul, after which it yearned with irrepressible solicitude . . . was so unspeakably consolatory, and relieved especially the less reflective mind, from so much doubt and anxiety, that mankind was disposed to hail with gladness, rather than examine with jealous suspicion these claims of the hierarchy."

It is a significant fact, in our own days, that the power of Popery is declining on the Continent, but increasing in England. I have in my own mind an explanation, which is clear and convincing to myself. I will at present only say that the causes of the phenomenon appear to me substantially the same as those which introduced the Papacy into Christendom at first.

I shall be particularly gratified if some of your contributors, better qualified than myself, will bring forward their views on the historical aspect of this great and deeply interesting question.

J. B.

Canonbury, July 23rd, 1890.

MRS. GLADSTONE distributed the prizes to the girls of the Burlington School, London, on Thursday. In response to an appeal from the Rev. J. E. Kempe, rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, Mr. Gladstone said that in 1833, when he became a parishioner of St. James's, and a pretty regular attendant at St. James's, all the institutions of the parish were, as now, admirably managed; but undoubtedly a very great transformation change had since passed over this interesting institution. "The efficiency of popular education partook at that period really more of the sort of discipline by which you would govern an army or a prison than of those methods suitable for arriving at the hearts and improving the understanding of the young; always bearing in mind this—that the education of the mind is best effected through the heart; but that was an idea almost new two generations ago. Well, ladies, you who belong to the favoured half of the human race, enormous changes have taken place in your position, not only in your actual, but also in your prospective positions of members of society. It is almost terrible to look back upon the state of women sixty years, upon the manner in which they were viewed by the law, and the scanty provision made for their welfare, and the gross injustice, the flagrant injustice, the shameful injustice to which, in certain particulars, they were subjected. Great changes have taken place, and still greater, I will not say are impending, but are much discussed. Whether all these greater changes to which many look forward with eager anticipations will be for good I will not undertake to say; but I will say that I believe that anything which attempts or affects to alter fundamentally the relation which the Almighty Himself has established, and the design which He has marked out in our constitutions and capacities, to alter that relation, to draw woman essentially out of her own sphere, and to expect her to change it for the sphere of man, or to act in both, with the presumption that she can act in both the one and the other with equal efficiency, is a matter which in my most sanguine anticipations I do not think will succeed. But so far as we have gone the alterations that have been made, and that have in so considerable a degree met the wants of women, relieved the real grievances of women, and improved their prospects, and given them, with increased opportunities increased responsibilities—I do

firmly believe that these changes have been, so far as I have been acquainted with them, undoubtedly for good. You have before you opportunities such as were totally unknown—almost entirely unknown to your mothers, absolutely unknown to your grandmothers. In the great reconstruction of this school, which has given it a new character, opportunities have enormously increased and hopes and prospects for usefulness are multiplied. The great and glorious Universities of England, which were formerly the absolute monopoly of the masculine moiety of the human race, are now in a great degree open to you. They are not less open to you than is actually the case with ladies who betake themselves to Oxford, and, in a much larger degree, to Cambridge ; for all obtain indirectly a great deal of benefit from the ancient endowments, because they have placed at their command the admirable machinery, the efficient and powerful and varied staff, which conduct instruction in these establishments—an instruction that is very inadequately represented by the mere fees paid ; and no doubt a great advantage is derived by young ladies from the endowments of the colleges and Universities. I hope the time is not far distant when we shall go a little further."

AT the auction mart, on the 18th inst., Messrs. Norton, Trist and Gilbert sold forty-eight acres, being a portion of the glebe lands, belonging to the benefice of Abinger, near Dorking, and of the agricultural value of £45 per annum, for £8,350. This is the second public sale since the passing of the Act in 1888, and the purchase money, which must be reinvested, will produce in future for the living, even if invested in Consols, about £220 per annum in lieu of £45 as heretofore.

THE Bishop of Nottingham has offered to subscribe £100, providing nine other donors will do the same, towards a fund of £3,000, to be devoted to the purpose of providing additional church accommodation at Woodhall Spa, Lincolnshire. Several offers of a similar amount have been received.

IN connection with the Merchant Taylors' School Mission in West Hackney an octave of services has been held to celebrate the dedication by the Bishop of London of a Mission-room dedicated to St. Barnabas. Dr. Barker, the head master, and many other old and present Merchant Taylors' boys took part in the service.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows :—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adkins, Rev. Sydney S., M.A., Curate of St. John Baptist's, Hey, near Oldham ; Head Master of the Grammar School, Chorley.
Austin, Rev. Thomas, Chaplain to the *Galatea* (lent).
Baggallay, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Weymouth, Dorset ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Salisbury.
Beaumont, Rev. William Edwin, M.A., Vicar of Highmore, Oxon.
Blake, Rev. George L., Chaplain to the *Minotaur* (lent).
Blomfield, Rev. Louis Henry, B.A., Rector of Norton-sub-Hamdon, Ilminster.
Carpenter, Rev. Henry, Curate, Vicar of Compton Bishop, Weston-super-Mare.
Dixon, Rev. W. E., Missions to Seamen Chaplain for the shipping in Bristol Harbour and Kingroads.
Faulkner, Rev. H. J. H., Curate of St. Matthew's, Lightcliffe, Halifax ; Head Master of Hipperholme Grammar School.
Fellows, Rev. Thomas, B.A., T.C.D., late Curate-in-Charge of St. James's, Aylestone Park, Leicester ; Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Jersey.
Flynn, Rev. Francis, Chaplain to the *Northampton* (lent).
Glaister, Rev. William, M.A., B.C.L., Vicar of Grantham Lincolnshire ; Prebendary of Leighton Beaudesert in Lincoln Cathedral.
Hart, Rev. Frederick, B.A., Rector of Kimberley, Notts.
Hodges, Rev. William, Rector of Trusley, Derbyshire.
Jolly, Rev. John, B.A., Minister of St. Chrysostom's, Bradford.
London, Rev. George, Vicar of St. George's, Altrincham ; Vicar of St. Mark's, Dunham Town, Altrincham.
Long, Rev. William Edward, M.A., Rector of Holwell, Sherborne.
Lutener, Rev. W. M. B., Senior Curate of Bowdon ; Vicar of St. George's, Altrincham.
Marriott-Dodington, Rev. Henry Phelps, B.A., Vicar of Leigh, Sherborne.
Mayers, Rev. Joseph Shepherd, M.A., Vicar of Norton St. Philip, Somersetshire.
Meredith, Rev. J. L., M.A., Rector of Gelligaer ; Vicar of Llanelly, Carmarthenshire.
Miller, Rev. Herbert Gordon, M.A., Principal and Divinity Professor of Huron College, London, Canada West.
Murray, Rev. F. H., M.A., Rector of Chislehurst and Rural Dean of West Dartford ; Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.
Pelly, Rev. Stanley Augustus, Perpetual Curate of Swanwick, Derbyshire.
Perry-Gore, Rev. George, Perpetual Curate of St. Matthias's, Sneinton, Notts.
Pitman, Rev. Francis E., Chaplain to the *Inconstant* (lent).
Sanderson, Rev. James Richard, Vicar of Alderholt, Salisbury.
Taylor, Rev. C. R., M.A., Lecturer in Public Reading at King's College, London ; English Chaplain at Grenoble, France.
Thomas, Rev. David Walter, M.A., Vicar of St. Ann's, Llandegai, and Proctor in Convocation ; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bangor.
Trower, Rev. John, M.A, Vicar of Ottey ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Westmacott, Rev. Walter, Vicar of Highbridge, Somerset ; Vicar of St. Germans, Cornwall.
Whittingstall, Rev. Herbert Oakes Fearnley, M.A., Vicar of Great Marlow, Bucks.
White, Rev. Frederick G. H. H. E., M.A., Chaplain to the *Black Prince*,

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bigsby, Rev. Henry Julian, for thirty years Vicar of St. Thomas's Church, Southborough, at St. Thomas's Vicarage, Southborough, Tunbridge Wells, on the 14th inst., aged years.
Innes, Rev. Reginald Gipps Long, late Vicar of Whitton, Middlesex, at 8, Gunterstone Road, West Kensington, on the 15th inst., aged 46 years.
Linton, Rev. George, English Chaplain, and late Vicar of Corsham, at Bonn, Germany, on the 13th inst.
Phillpotts, Rev. Thomas, Canon of Truro, at Porthgwidden St. Feock, Cornwall, on the 19th inst., in his 8 year

The Church of England Pulpit.

CONFORMITY TO THE WORLD.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester, late Vicar of Penwortham.

Sermon Preached at the Temple, Deauville, near Trouville, France, on Sunday, July 20th, 1890.

"Be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God."—Rom. xii. 2.

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."—1 John ii. 15.

καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς, ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον.—Rom. xii. 2.

Μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ· ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ.—1 John ii. 15.

THESE two texts are the works of two different Apostles—men of very different temperaments and turn of mind, and who each of them possessed and used a different and characteristic vocabulary. Their language differs even here, in the most important word which each of the two texts contains, though to those who use either of our translations (the authorised or the revised) it seems the same. For, while to St. Paul the world, to which he forbids his correspondents to conform themselves, is the *αἰών*—the age, in which he and his fellow-Christians were then living; to St. John it is the *κόσμος*, literally the world, the whole fabric of human society, as it then was, and as it is now.

Now, if we had only St. Paul's text, it might be thought that the precept was only temporary, warning those who were then living not to follow the ways of a period, which was yet unleavened with Christian doctrine—an age as thoroughly wicked as that of Claudius and Nero really was. But, if we take St. John's words also into consideration, we find that the precept goes much farther; and that we are bidden even now, when Christianity has made such progress in the world, conquering it outwardly, and improving it inwardly, to keep our hearts free from the love of it, because there is still so much in it, which is not of the Father who is in heaven, and which is not of Christ.

I believe that the two Apostles' lessons are essentially the same; and that there is no practical difference between that world which St. John bade us not to love, and that present age, to which St. Paul forbade us to conform ourselves, and that each Apostle teaches, that a Christian, if he is a genuine one, must possess a certain independence of the opinions, and practices, and especially of the fashions of his age. It was so in the Apostles' time; and it is so still. Now this is a matter which is constantly occurring in practical religious life. Every one, who has had any serious thoughts, has often been met by the question—How far ought I to do, as I see the world around me doing? That question arises with regard to a great variety of things, and to earnest serious minds it often causes perplexity and pain.

Permit me then to offer you a study of this subject—Conformity and Non-conformity to the world. I will try to make it really a study. And to an educated congregation like the present, that will probably be more agreeable than an attempt at pulpit rhetoric.

2. Conformity to the present age—I am adopting literally St. Paul's phrase—may be defined as servile, unconscientious, deference to contemporary thought and practice.

It is thought to be a special danger of the age, in which we live, as being a democratic one.

A despot, whether spiritual or temporal, imposes his own will, and demands to be obeyed. But, in a democratic age, leaders can only preserve the appearance of leading by pleasing those who apparently follow, but really push them on. It is certainly so in politics where the most conspicuous men hardly pretend to do anything more than follow the bent of public opinion. It is so also in religion, which is becoming, in our day, much too like politics. I can remember not many years ago a great politician uttered, as a reason for a sweeping democratic change, a phrase, which, I think, was a clap-trap one—"Trust the people"; and hardly a few weeks passed by before a very eminent prelate took the word out of his mouth, and he too said, "Trust the people." Those who are interested in religion, whether as clergymen or as laymen, have the idea that religion cannot exist unless it be made popular. It must be borne up on the shoulders of thronging millions. It must find a key to the coffers of the wealthy. For it needs favour, support, popularity; above all it needs money, which is the sinews of all warfare, ecclesiastical as well as civil. Therefore, partly consciously and partly unconsciously, religious persons modify and arrange their doctrines and their practices to draw the favour of the present age. *Συσχηματίζονται τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ.*

This tendency of conformity to contemporary thoughts and ways is often aggravated by the dislike and disgust, which people in general feel, at an opposite evil, a parade and display of unworldliness, exhibited by those who specially profess religion. Religious people have been inclined, in all ages, and in all persuasions, to put on outwardly a pro-

fession of austere superiority to the ways and fashions of the world. This tendency was conspicuous, in our Saviour's days, in the fringes and phylacteries of the Pharisees, in their minute observance of ceremonial practices, to the neglect of the weightier matters of the law. It was equally conspicuous, in our own country, in the affected scriptural phraseology of the Puritans, and their sweeping condemnation of the amusements and relaxations of the world. It is conspicuous amongst us still, both in those who profess an exclusively spiritual religion, and in those who attach the highest importance to ceremonial or sacramental observances. It is better not to particularize with regard to contemporary faults and make-believes; but thoughtful minds, whose aim is not to condemn others, but to correct themselves, will see plenty of unreal practices in which a Christian ought not to take part, and unreal words that he ought not to say, on both sides of the present ecclesiastical world. The evil, springing as it does from a deep source in perennial human nature, reappears in all ages and in all societies. So that everywhere alike persons find themselves tempted, while rejecting the outward appearance of worldliness, to retain meanwhile the whole of its central evil, which is self-indulgence, self-interest, and self-display, or; as St. John expresses himself in his own antique and simple language, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life. These were to him the sum total of the whole contemporary world which he saw around him, and these, leavened as our world is to some extent by Christian influences, remain a very large part of our contemporary world, and are still the great dangers to Christians and the great enemies of Christ. They are the real Antichrists, in fact, against which all who would be Christians must watch and pray.

These unreal pretensions of religious people are seen by the irreligious to be hypocrisies, or at least unconscious self-delusions. They tend to render religion more than ever distasteful to the *mondains*—those who profess and parade their own conformity and devotion to the world. And they encourage such people to dismiss it from their thoughts as a false and unreal thing.

Thus, between insincere unworldliness, and un-Christian worldliness—the false friend and the open enemy of Christ—those who would be religious often find themselves in a difficulty to try and determine (δοκιμάζειν) what is the "good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God." It is a difficulty which meets every one who is at all serious-minded, and which is often very painful to sensitive consciences. It occurs in numberless points of practical life, as many of my hearers will have experienced themselves. I propose now to come down into some of these practical points, and to present to you some considerations respecting them, which, I trust, may be not entirely without their use.

(*a.*) With regard to amusements, either the joyous childishness, which delights so many popular communities on the continent of Europe, or the sadder pleasures, to which we have been accustomed in our gloomier island, the question is constantly arising, Is this right or wrong? We find that there *is* such a thing as wholesome recreation, and also there *is* such a thing as injurious dissipation. But then it is only an invisible and often a shifting line, which parts the two. And that line is very difficult to see.

(*b.*) With regard to expenditure of money—as we consider the practice of the world around us, and especially of the very rich, we see that there is such a thing as sinful extravagance and sinful ostentation; and also that there is a legitimate use of God's gifts, according to the will of Him who gives us all things bountifully to enjoy. And between the two there is again the invisible line. And that line, we think, must be very difficult indeed for a millionaire to determine, with his vast wealth, and enormous responsibilities; and it is not so easily seen always even by persons of limited means like ourselves.

(*c.*) In our employment of time—a very practical subject for us to consider, while many of us are taking a holiday. There is such a thing as rising up early, and late taking rest, and eating the bread of carefulness, and devoting of the whole of our time and thought to the making of a fortune. And there is such a thing as spending every day and every hour in what we believe to be God's will concerning us. And, again, between the right and the wrong, the good and the evil, the boundary line is very difficult to see. The line is again an invisible one.

(*d.*) Once more with regard to a detail, and one of very frequent occurrence in the course of foreign travel. The observance of the Sabbath Day, to which, in the most ancient times, a place was divinely accorded in the Decalogue, and which we have, probably all of us, been brought up to reverence as an institution with a higher than merely human sanction. Where is the point that parts a thoughtful reverent sanctification of a beneficent and happy day of worship from an external performance of a harsh ceremonial rule? Again, the line is exceedingly difficult to see. The question is constantly occurring to the more thoughtful of our country people. Ought we to relax our insular practices as we see the world around us doing? Ought we to yield to the continental influences, and do at Rome as Rome does? Or ought we to take up an attitude of uncompromising resistance, and continue to be, as we were described in very ancient times, *penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos*—divided in practices, and habits, and beliefs, as well as by the silver streak of sea, and retaining our insularity, even when we pass that boundary?

Similar questions occur with regard to a mul-

titude of matters—of dress, of manners, of society, of literature, of business relations; and we find that the invisible line, of which we have been speaking, occurs in every one.

We come, then, to the practical question—What is to be done? Amongst all these invisible lines, which are so difficult to distinguish between the right and the wrong, how may we learn to approve what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God? How may we succeed in keeping a conscience without offence towards God and towards man? How may we prevent the way of truth being spoken against on account of anything that we ourselves may say or do?

As we reflect seriously upon that question, we find that Holy Scripture, which is our guide, does not enter into detail. That, indeed, would be impossible amidst the varieties, and changes, and complications of earthly things. But it lays down great principles, which the careful and sensitive conscience will apply to the details of things, and in which it will find for itself a very sufficient guide.

Of such principles I think that I can identify two—those, namely, stated in my two texts, both of which are very far-reaching and profound.

One of these principles is to be found in the text, which was taken from St. John. It is negative—"Love not the world." The world, which took its tone and its fashions from the Roman court contemporary with John, was the open and decided enemy of Christ. In it those Antichristian principles—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—or, as we translated them into more modern language, self-indulgence, self-interest, and self-display, ruled and reigned unmixed and supreme. "Love not that evil world," said the Apostle, "for it is not of the Father, and it is not of Christ."

At present the world is a mixed thing, which has spread over its practices a certain varnish of Christianity, and has even embodied in its own self a certain slight inward leaven of Christ. But yet a great part of its inward motives and its outward ways are still ruled by those three evil Antichristian principles—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—by self-indulgence, self-interest, and self-display. Love none of those three evil things, and wherever you find them ruling in the world, there love not the world; do not suffer your hearts to attach themselves to it, and do not conform to its usages and ways. Above all, never let them dominate or rule yourself—your heart or your life.

Now this is really a very plain and simple test. Consider how the world in which you live employs its time—how it amuses itself, how it spends its money, how it dresses, how it eats and drinks, what it reads, how it conducts its religious observances, and spends its Sabbath-Day. And where your conscience tells you that it is ruled and guided by no higher motives than self-indulgence, self-interest, and self-display, there love it not, and do not adopt its usages, or allow yourself its indulgences. For, if any man love that world, the love of the Heavenly Father is not in him.

This is the first principle—a negative one, as was said.

And then there follows a positive one, which we read in the context of that text of St. Paul, who is here (what he is not usually) even deeper than St. John. That Apostle pointed out, as the remedy for all sinful conformity to the world, a higher and deeper self-devotion. He said, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." "Present your bodies a living sacrifice"—*living*—that is, together with the souls which animate them and form their real life. Present the whole being, body, soul and spirit, an offering to God, to be ruled by His laws, and devoted to His will.

In other words, have the highest aim; and take the worthiest view, and make the noblest use, of life. Life is not indulgence; it is not amusement; it is not money-making; it is duty; it is service; it is obedience to the will of God. Life (whatever the Evolutionists may say) is not the slave of its environment; it is not forced, nor intended, merely to reflect the casual influences of that world by which it is surrounded; it may be, and it must be, ruled by an inward power—a conscience determined to do the will of God, wherever it can recognise that will; it must be directed to a purpose, dedicated to a service, governed by a law; its solid substance must be work and duty, and its motive devotion to God's will.

The mind, which has this solid basis of motive well and truly laid, will be found to be transformed from worldliness, and renewed in its inward spirit. And, when it descends into detail, and considers practical questions, such as those which have been already mentioned, it will discern instinctively, intuitively, the right course in each particular. It never will be content merely to reflect external influences, and just to do what other people do. It will have within itself its own motive, and law, and light.

As practical questions, respecting the way of duty, arise often suddenly and unexpectedly, a sort of instinct or intuition is required, by which to determine each rapidly and with decision. In practical life it is not possible to be at every moment referring to first principles. Our guide must be a present guide, always ready to point out, as guides do, the intricacies of the path which has to be followed. And such an instinct will be possessed by everyone who has really and genuinely presented himself a living sacrifice, and has then practised his conscience in ascertaining the good and true and perfect will of God.

We have often read that he, whose will it is to do God's will, knows the truth of doctrine. It is

equally true that he, whose will it is to do God's will, knows the right and wrong of practice. He finds himself possessed of an inward test by which he can solve quickly and surely each question which arises in daily life. On each he tries, and proves, and ascertains, and acts upon, what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. You see—all depends on the motive. If that be to please self, every choice will be wrong. It it be to to please God, everyone will be right.

I do not know whether I have succeeded in making the meaning clear. Let me state the two principles once more.

He that would keep from sinful worldliness, and undue acquiescence in worldly ways, must take heed to keep his heart unenslaved by anything in contemporary life, the motives of which are the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—self-indulgence, self-interest, and self-display.

And he must present himself to be ruled inwardly and outwardly by God according to His will.

The effect of such high motives will be seen in all the detail of his practice. He will never be one of those emancipated English people, of whom we sometimes read and hear, who have lost the good ways of their native home, without acquiring the virtues of the foreigners among whom they live. He will combine the excellencies while avoiding the faults; serious amongst the trifling; dutiful among the self-indulgent; rationally religious amongst the superstitious. With his heart in the right place, and his motives the highest, he will cling to all the good traditions of his fatherland, yet not be blind to the good which is to be found elsewhere.

And, in all matters and situations alike, he will feel and will show that religion must be independent of the fashions of the place and of the hour. Religion is very apt to follow fashions. If there be a new style of preaching, or a new mode of worship, or of decoration, the crowd of religious people are drawn by it just like the worldlings. But religion, when it suffers itself to be thus led, is false to its own origin, and proclaims aloud that it too is a thing of the hour and of this present world. If it be religion, indeed, it is a higher, and deeper, and greater thing, round which the fashions of this world may have their play, but which itself remains uninfluenced by them, solid, and fixed, and changeless, and durable, like God, and like eternity.

Let ours be ever such, for none other will stand us in stead in the hour of death and in the day of judgment.

THE Royal Commission on Interments in Westminster Abbey adjourned on Wednesday last, for the recess. They will probably meet again in November. In the meanwhile the evidence taken before them will be printed, together with plans setting forth the various proposals for enlarging the capacity of the Abbey.

WORSHIP OF THE SACRED HEART.

BY THE REV. R. R. KANE, LL.D., INCUMBENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, BELFAST.

SERMON PREACHED IN CHRIST CHURCH, BELFAST, ON SUNDAY, JUNE 29TH, 1890.

"And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge."—EPHES. iii. 19.

DEVOTION or worship in religion is the highest act and service of which human beings are capable. God has made us rational and moral, just that we may worship Him. The creation of man was the crowning. work of the Creator. Things of splendour, like the sun; of strength, like the lion and the horse; of beauty, like the flower; of swiftness, like the eagle, had been created; but none of them were capable of offering to God that love and service and trust and adoration which are comprehended in worship. They had no soul to apprehend the majesty and the goodness and the holiness of the Creator, and to worship Him who created all things, and for whose pleasure they are and were created. And so God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." And God made man—made him a moral, rational creature—that he might read the music from the open page of nature, and give it voice in pæans of thankfulness and joyful adoration to Him—the Almighty, All-wise, All-good God, by Whose word the heavens were made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth. This is what distinguishes man from the material universe and from the merely animal creation. He and he alone is capable of offering to God worship springing out of a consciousness of the goodness, majesty, and wisdom of the Divine Creator. And, indeed, God created man in His own image that he might worship and serve Him. We can, in the splendour of the sun, in the roar of the thunder, in the beauty of the flower, in the song of the bird—we can, in these voices and objects of nature, hear and realise to ourselves a whole orchestra of music ever celebrating the praises of the Divine Power by Whose Almighty hand they were created; but it needs the ear of reason, the moral and rational soul, to interpret the song of nature and to offer it with acceptable reverence at the shrine of Jehovah. Now, you know, my brethren, how in the inspired records of our race which God has given us in His own Holy Book, how the most solemn acts of men at the most eventful periods of history were acts of devotion or worship offered, of course, to God and to God alone. Adam offered sacrifices to God, and of the skins of the beasts offered in sacrifice to God he made for himself and his wife coats and covered them. Abraham was a worshipper of God. On his journeys, in his wars, in all the multiform engagements and activities of his life he failed not to remember and to go to Bethel where

the altar was which he had made there at the first, and there Abram called on the name of the Lord. Noah, when he came forth from the ark, consecrated the earth afresh by building an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl and offered burnt-offerings unto the Lord. And as an acknowledgment of God's approval of this worship of Himself the promise was given that, "While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease." But I do not need to be very specific on this point. You know, brethren, that the worship of God, when sincerely and believingly observed and practised, has always been attended by the richest blessing, and that idolatry, whatever form it may assume, is most hateful to God, and has ever been punished by His displeasure and by divers and most heavy judgments, for "the Lord our God is a jealous God," as He says by the Prophet Isaiah, "I am the Lord, that is My name, and My glory will I not give to another, neither My praise to graven images." This is no light matter. Whether we look to the examples, commands, promises, or threats of Holy Scripture, we find one great truth irresistibly borne in upon our minds, that idol worship, creature worship, every other worship but the worship of God Almighty, is a capital offence against the law of the Author of our being, a prostitution of human nature, and a most certain provocation of wrath and judgment from the Most High; as God says of an idolatrous land, "A sword is upon her waters, and they shall be dried up, for it is the land of graven images, and they are mad upon their idols." Certainly, it would seem to me that the people are mad upon their idols who in the closing decade of the nineteenth century set up a new fetich in Belfast, and prophesy that the establishment of this brand new cult will prove such a source of blessing that generations to come will rise up and call them blessed who in the year 1890 introduced it amongst us. The date of the introduction of this devotion is instructive, since the community that establishes it and stands sponsor for it claims with great jealousy to be the old religion as well as the only true religion. How does the confessed novelty of this worship agree with the boastful and jealous claim of her Roman religion to be the old religion established since and even before the days of St. Patrick in this country? St. Patrick built innumerable churches in this country, but he did not build one to the Sacred Heart. He practised devotion with great piety himself, but he knew nothing of devotion to the Sacred Heart. He, by his doctrine and example and exhortation, by God's grace inflamed with devotion the minds of the Irish nation, so that his name and his work are remembered to this day with great reverence and thankfulness; but there was not a syllable from his lips about devotion to the Sacred Heart. The Irish Church in the day of her glory and sanctity and missionary zeal had a pure worship as well as a pure creed, and to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the co-equal and co-eternal persons of the ever blessed and adorable Trinity, did her worship ascend. In her hymns and prayers, and sufferings and labours, she worshipped God, and Him alone, singing in her zealous missionary efforts, or in the martyr's fire, the hymn of the ages—"Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen." You have heard, my brethren, of the Culdees. They were an association of men in the ancient Church of Ireland. They were founded by St. Columba in the earlier half of the sixth century, and devoted themselves to different kinds of work, some of them to what we would call now pastoral work, working for their livelihood with their own hands, but at the same time watching for the souls of the people, and all the while teaching the people with great aptitude and self-denial various kinds of handicraft and useful arts. Some devoted themselves to missionary work, which was, perhaps, the primary object of their institution, and to the glory of God and renown of the Irish Church, carried the Gospel far and wide, beyond the confines of the British Islands, and distant places, where traces of their presence and work can still be easily identified; and some of them were teachers in those schools which attracted the youth of Europe, and gained for Ireland the proud title of the University of the West. Now, who were these Culdees? I suppose, if one wanted a short and expressive name for the persons who are so busy introducing and diffusing the cultus of the Sacred Heart, he would call them Culcordiacs. Culdees is an abbreviation of two Latin words, *cultores Dei*—worshippers of God. The Culdees were, perhaps, the strongest Protestants of whom we read in all Irish history. Columbanus was one of them, and he charged the Bishop of Rome in the most forcible way with heresy. Aidan was one of them, and he celebrated Easter after the manner, not of Rome, but of Ireland; opposed auricular confession, rejected the tonsure, and baptised infants without the consecrated chrism. Bishop Dagan was one of them, and he refused to eat or remain in the same house with a Roman legate whose mission was to extend the benediction of Rome over the British and Irish Churches. But the peculiar glory of this ancient and honoured religious order was that they were worshippers of God, and existed in the early days of Irish Christian history to establish the worship and kingdom of God; and hence they were called Culdees, or God-worshippers, not Culcordiacs or heart-worshippers. But, my brethren, let me say something of this new cultus, for which so much virtue is claimed, that people, "in all their darkest trials and in all their greatest needs" are exhorted with mind and heart "at once to repair

to the special shrine of the Heart of Jesus." I do not need to remind you how tender, how infinite is the love of Jesus Christ. Who can tell how He loved us poor sinners, when from His throne in heaven He saw our lost and helpless condition. For our sakes He became poor, took upon Him the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. It is impossible for us to represent fully to our minds the infinite love of Him who redeemed us. A patriot may sacrifice himself for his country; a parent for his child; a friend for his friend. Examples of such love are to be met with in history, and they are so singular and so striking as to have secured places for themselves in the historic page apart from all common surroundings. But God commendeth His love to us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. And, brethren, how tender and pitiful and prompt was His love when helplessness and want and sin appealed to Him. The leper, the Lazarus, the Magdalene, even the robber, turning to Him found Him all peace and pity and love, so that He said to one, "I will, be thou clean," and to another, "Rise, take up thy bed and walk," and to a third, "Go and sin no more," and to a fourth, "This day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise." And, thank God, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." His love is as tender, as prompt, as pitiful as when, 1,800 years ago, in the form of the Man of Sorrows, He trod the sinful earth; and want and sin and helplessness will appeal to Him now with as much effect as then.

> "His eye of love is downward bent,
> Still ranging to and fro,
> Where'er in this dark wilderness
> There roams the child of woe.
> Nor His alone, the Three in One,
> Who looked through Jesus' eye,
> Could still the harps of angel bands
> To hear the suppliant cry."

He reaches out His arms from His heavenly throne and says to the helpless and sinful and needy, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," and thousands and tens of thousands feel the rest and joy of taking Jesus at His word and trusting in His grace and faithfulness and love as the Saviour, even as St. Paul, who says, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." And "we love Him because He first loved us," and worship Him for the everlasting love which dwells in Him. But what is this monstrous perversion of Christian sentiment and worship to which the attention of the Christian public of Belfast has been challenged, "The Devotion of the Sacred Heart"? Hear what the Roman bishop's selected preacher says—"I will end with saying one word about this church practically. It is the first church dedicated specially to the heart of Jesus in this city. I know not but that it may be the first church of the heart of Jesus in this diocese of Down and Connor. Anyway, it is the first in Belfast, and from that truth follows a great consequence." What is the great consequence that follows from this fact that in this diocese, which includes the scene of St. Patrick's boyhood, and in which he breathed out his soul to God after sixty years' labours in the Gospel of God—that in this diocese a church never was dedicated to the cultus of the heart of Jesus until Sunday, the 15th June, 1890. What, I say, is the great consequence that follows from this fact? Why, that the religion of Rome is as novel as it is false and corrupt. "This is the church of the adorable Heart of Jesus. Here night and day the Heart of Jesus dwells in the tabernacle. You have its emblem in the statue above the altar." The story of the origin of this devotion is the most miserable, contemptible, inane piece of profane enthusiasm which even Rome has ever attempted to impose upon the credulity of her devotees. There was a poor visionary creature named Margaret Mary Alacoque, who claimed that on the 16th of June, 1675, our Saviour appeared to her, and showed her His heart surrounded with thorns and surmounted with a cross. This poor woman proclaimed that our Saviour expressed to her His desire that the devotion to His sacred heart should be spread throughout the world. Our Lord is represented as asking her for her heart, which He then places in His heart, when it appears as a little atom in a consuming furnace. Our Saviour then withdraws her heart in a burning flame, and again restores it to the place from which He had taken it in His own heart, and He places in her side a little spark of the vivid flames of His love to serve her as a heart, and to consume her to the last moment of her life! And then He said to her, "You have taken hitherto the name of My slave. I give you from this time that of the beloved disciple of My sacred heart." Now the Romanists of Belfast may receive and digest this blasphemous nonsense if they are so incredibly irrational and superstitious; but I avow before God that it is not only heretical and anti-scriptural to the very core, but it is positively the most degrading and stupid idolatry it is possible to imagine. It is very true that the heart is regarded as the seat of the affections, the symbol of love, and so we may say the heart of Jesus is very tender, very pitiful, very full of love; but then we mean that He Himself is very tender, very pitiful, very full of love, and every sane person knows that the heart is no more the seat of the affections than any other part of the body. That which wills, which thinks, which loves, is wholly spiritual. And as the astronomer can sweep the heavens with his telescope and nowhere come upon God, who is a spirit, and, therefore invisible; so the anatomist can ransack the human frame with his knife, and nowhere come upon that which loves and wills and thinks, because it is spiritual, and, therefore, intangible and invisible? What folly is this, then, which invites worshippers

of God to become worshippers of the physical bodily organ of our Lord's human body. I have said that this cultus is heretical and anti-Scriptural to the very core! Will it affect members of the Roman Church to know that this novel devotion, introduced here under the warm patronage of their bishop, is undeniable heresy? They have ever heresy in their lips when speaking of our religion. It seems to be the hardest and weightiest stone they have to throw at us. Will they be pleased—the bishop or any one of his clergy, including the selected and belauded preacher of the 15th of June—to specify any heresy which attaches to our religion? We give them the Bible and the primitive creeds and councils, and we dare them to convict us in any one particular of heresy, and, on the other hand, we charge them with being steeped to the lips in heresy, and here we specify a heresy, the fruit of the fevered brain of a miserable enthusiast. Two General Councils—Chalcedon and Ephesus—forbade any worship being offered to a divided Christ, even the separate adoration of our Lord's sacred humanity apart from His godhead being heretical, and decreed that the whole Christ alone is to be worshipped. Now, if it be heretical to worship even the whole body unless as united with the second person of the most holy Trinity, much more must it be heretical to worship a single organ or member of that body. The Christ we worship is the Christ of the Catholic Creeds, "For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, *so God and man is one Christ.*" "One Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten son of God. . . God of God. . . And was made man. . . Perfect God and perfect man." But they worship the heart, the physical, bodily organ—a piece of His humanity. Men and brethren, in the name of God, is that Catholic Christian worship, or heretical? Why, it is like the pagan worship that St. Athanasius rebuked when he says, as quoted by Dr. Littledale, "Others, dismembering the parts of the body, took the head, the shoulders, the hands, the feet, and made gods of them, serving them with divine worship, as if it were not enough for them to pay devotion to the whole, undivided body." I pray God, my brethren, that I may not utter one word which will prevent my Roman brethren from looking dispassionately at this matter for themselves. If I speak strongly I certainly do not go beyond the example set me by the Jesuit preacher, whom the Roman bishop set up to preach at a service to which Protestants had been invited as collectors and contributors. I have not time to refer at any length to other peculiar devotions of the Roman religion, but you must hear one instructive episode from the history of Roman devotions—the Miracle of La Salette. Two children attending cows saw a garishly-dressed lady, who told them she was the Virgin Mary, discoursed to them on the sins of France, and gave them messages in the name of her Son. The children told the story, and La Salette became a famous place for pilgrims, where all kinds of miracles were wrought. An English Roman bishop believed in the vision, and had a church opened in his diocese to our Lady of La Salette, and everyone who hesitated to adopt the new cultus was denounced as utterly wanting in faith. What, however, was the sequel? Some of the priests of the neighbouring dioceses declared the whole thing to be an imposture, named the nun who represented herself to the children as being the Virgin Mary, and when the nun took an action for defamation of character it was proved to the satisfaction of the Court and of an Appeal Court afterwards that she bought the dress in which the Virgin appeared. This was the end of a devotion which awakened extraordinary enthusiasm for a time, and to which the Pope extended his warm patronage. By a brief, dated August 26, 1852, he made the altar of La Salette a privileged altar, and gave a plenary indulgence to visitors to the shrine. God forbid that I should say one word which would prevent my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen from studying this question for themselves, and if I do speak strongly I am only following the example of the priests at the service to which I have referred—a service to which Protestants were invited to come and collect and subscribe. One would think that the canons of common politeness would have prevented this priest from introducing controversial matters at such a service, but at the same time I think that those Protestants who did attend that service deserved to be bombarded with all the Popery this man could command. My dear brethren, while we see the errors and perverting stories imposed upon other people for truth, and how agreeable to the Word of God is our own religion, let us be thankful to God for His glorious Gospel; and while others are so misled as to worship "the sacred heart of Jesus" and "the immaculate heart of Mary," let us worship with a warm devotion and a sincere and ardent adoration, and render a loving, consistent service to our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is worthy, and to Whom through the eternal ages angels and redeemed men shall offer the pure and grand and undying worship of heaven—

"O, that with yonder sacred throng
We at His feet might fall—
There join the everlasting song,
And crown Him Lord of All."

THE election of Rural Deans for the archdeaconry of London for the next five years is now complete. The names of the new Rural Deans are as follows:—East City, the Rev. A. Povah, rector of St. Olave, Hart-street; West City, the Rev. L. B. White, D.D., rector of St. Mary Aldermary; Hackney, the Rev. F. W. Kingsford, vicar of St. Thomas's, Stamford-hill; Islington; the Rev. W. H. Barlow, vicar of Islington; St. Sepulchre's, the Rev. W. G. Abbott, rector of St. Luke's, Old-street; Shoreditch, the Rev. Septimus Buss, vicar of Shoreditch; Spitalfields, the Rev. A. J. Robinson, rector of Whitechapel; Stepney, the Rev. G. A. M. How, vicar of Bromley St. Leonard.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON. at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 2, 1890.

"LONDON OVER THE BORDER."

THIS is the title applied to that portion of East London which lies on the Essex side of the river Lea, and is therefore embraced in the diocese of St. Albans. It is generally supposed that this diocese consists of parishes differing very materially from the average run of those in East London; but it would indeed surprise the most ordinary observer were he for the nonce to pay a visit to the district mentioned. The densely populated neighbourhoods which are ever increasing in this part of Essex are or ought to be a far greater source of anxiety to the earnest Churchman than even the picturesque poverty of Whitechapel and Stepney. It is seldom realised, we suppose, that *most* of the real shipping interests lie beyond the confines of the diocese of East London. Already there ought to be considerable interest felt in such districts as Canning Town, Stratford and Plaistow, whilst the Victoria and Albert Docks add no mean complement of work to the "dock labourer" population of the former district. Nor could those who have not visited the district realise what is involved by the factories, gas and other works in Beckton, Silvertown, &c. There is, however, a marked difference between the general character of the two sides of the river Lea. On the London side the class of house is fairly good, while the considerable admixture of residences of a superior stamp, coupled with many first-class shops, &c., give one the impression of an active and flourishing neighbourhood. On the other the long monotonous rows of two-floor houses, which hardly vary at all in their architecture, the unfinished state of the neighbourhood and the general deadness everywhere apparent, must impress the visitor with a feeling of the utter hopelessness of the place, inasmuch as he will fail to find any residences of the kind which it could be supposed might lend a favourable variation to the general dulness. That there already is some Church life and that some provision is made for the religious needs of the new and teeming population cannot be denied, but in our opinion there is much to be done. If the Church is to reach the masses, surely the Church among the masses ought to be strong—strong in every sense of the word. In this portion of the diocese new districts are constantly being formed, and in consequence new mission-halls and churches being built, but that there must be some inadequacy is obvious from the fact that dissent is rife here, and that Nonconformist chapels are thickly scattered about.

There seems a want of thoroughness in the way districts have been dealt with in this important neighbourhood, a want of thoroughness in the construction of the churches, the distribution of funds and the general ecclesiastical tone. What is to be done? For the answer we hopefully look to the new Bishop, trusting that he will be able to devise some practical scheme for the amelioration of this portion of his charge, and that there will soon be so great an increase in the "Fund" at his disposal that it will be possible for all necessities of so important a region, as far as it touches the relations of the Established Church, to be thoroughly and promptly dealt with.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury and the Earls of Mansfield and Selborne, the electors to the Warburton Lectureship, have appointed the Rev. F. H. Woods vicar of Chalfont, Bucks, in succession to the Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick. Mr. Woods was formerly a Fellow and Theological Lecturer of St. John's College Oxford, Junior Hall and Houghton Greek Testament Prizeman (1874), Denyer and Johnson Scholar and Houghton Syriac Prizeman (1875). The subject of the lectures is the Fulfilment of Prophecy. They are delivered in Lincoln's-inn Chapel on the first Sunday in Advent, the first Sunday of February, and the first Sunday of March in each year.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

Reviews and Notices.

"PRESBYTERIANISM IN DUBLIN AND THE SOUTH AND WEST OF IRELAND." By Charles H. Irwin. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1890.

THIS is a very creditable and industrious work. The author makes the best of a hard job. He tells us how Presbyterianism came over from Scotland. He tells us that some bishops were favourable to it. We see the same in Hooker. They made allowances for foreign Protestants, who would have had bishops if they could. But all the same, the canons assert that there can be only one Church in one place. No doubt some with only Presbyterian orders got into parishes; but, whereas some of these were ejected for want of Episcopal orders, there is no case on record where any Presbyterian, who was attacked, retained his parish. The law was plain, wherever its decision was claimed. Mr. Irwin gives many cases where congregations in Dublin, Cork and Bandon, lapsed into Arianism. We searched in vain for any notice of the changes, threatened in America, as to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession. If Calvinism goes, what remains will be the play with Hamlet left out.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE GERMAN REEDS.

SIR,—I think Mr. Sandlands' letter is the weakest I ever read. In his first paragraph he uses the words *recreation* and *pleasure*. In his second paragraph he uses the word *amusement*. So he must regard these words as synonymous. If, then, the Scriptural teachers condemn all pleasure, how can Mr. Sandlands, in his second paragraph, say that the amusement (of the Reeds) may be innocent. If he is right, the teachers are wrong.

In his third paragraph he gives us his opinion that "the last thing a religious teacher should think of is to provide amusement." Is Mr. Sandlands a father? Does he never think of providing amusement for his children? Does he never think of a school treat, and its amusements? If he takes pupils, I pity the youths who are taught by their earthly teacher that all amusement is condemned by their Scripture teachers.

In his fourth paragraph Mr. Sandlands seems to condemn every recreation or amusement, unless it deepens his devotion, strengthens his faith, enlarges his hope, intensifies his love. Oh, miserable delusion, to suppose that every "innocent" amusement must be accompanied by these results. I despise a devotion, a faith, a hope, a love which is hedged about with such bigotry. When Mr. Sandlands wrote his imbecile letter, "Did he pray for a blessing? And did he thank God for it? And was the blessing lasting?"

W. A.

July 27th.

SIR,—We all know that Mr. Sandlands is fond of newspaper discussions, and also that your columns are open to any reasonable investigation, and therefore I am willing to meet him in a Christian and friendly spirit. His questions to me are based upon his own statement that "Scripture never speaks of pleasure, save to condemn it." What, then, is this pleasure so utterly condemned? Certainly, neither of those forms of it which I have described as entertainment, recreation, and amusement. I have diligently "searched the Scriptures," with the result that in the Greek both of the New Testament and LXX, there are several words translated by "pleasure" in the English Bible, and that, with one exception, they are invariably applied to offences against the *body*, lust and concupiscence. The exception referred to is that in Ecclesiastes "enjoy pleasure." Here we have ἀγαθόν, which shows that *this* pleasure is not bad, but *good* in itself. It is only, as our Lord would say, "when we *trust* in pleasure, and set our affections upon it that it becomes sinful. I am well on in years now, but I used to be a swift runner in my youth, and I remember that I took encouragement from St. Paul's injunction, "So run that ye may obtain," believing that what was good for the spiritual ought also to be good for the physical man. And when I read of "the cunning player upon an harp," who drove out the evil spirit from Saul, and also the command to "praise God in the cymbals and dances," I could only conclude that mental relief and relaxation were not only lawful but expedient, since "a merry heart doeth good like a medicine." Instead of its being "unbecoming in a religious paper or teacher" to advocate and provide amusement—which, I suppose, Mr. Sandlands would agree with Mr. Borthwick-Brown in calling "the devil's mission." I unhesitatingly maintain that it is the duty of both to promote every healthy recreation for mind and body, not because the *letter*, but the spirit of the divine revelation enjoins it. I am not concerned with absolute definitions and hard and fast lines of distinction, for what is one man's meat is another man's poison, and I can well understand that even the particular entertainment I have so ardently commended might be unsuited to many minds. On the other hand, there is good even in a music-hall, and much as I detest the profanity which one occasionally hears at such places, I am fully persuaded that St. Paul would only have been following in the steps of our Divine Master, Who ate and drank with publicans and sinners, had he lived to meet our clerical and lay representatives "in solemn conclave" on the subject of public amusements.

I seldom enter a theatre or music-hall myself, but I have more than once been to the latter with those whom I know have been able to benefit, by diverting their attention from the dangerous portions, and pointing out what was really worth attention. That amusement is too much thought of is undeniable. Now-a-days there are many predisposing causes, such as the congestion of labour and population, and the excitement and whirl of city life. But, to take for instance the drink curse, I am sure that less is consumed inside a music-hall than would be taken outside it in the same period of time. As to the German Reed's Entertainment, if Mr. Sandlands will turn to my articles, he will perceive that I did *not* say that this amusement was *confined* to holding up any foibles to ridicule much less *personal* foibles. The personal element is left for that sink of scandal, the Society papers. If, however, to mimic Society foibles should lead to their rejection, and the lessening of personal vanity and self-conceit, the more we have of it the better. If all kinds of pleasure be sinful, then we must

deny ourselves and our belongings even such recreative change of scene and surroundings as is essential to health. "Clerical holidays" have been frequently advocated in these columns, but henceforth they must be entirely given up, and brother Sandlands's olive branches must meditate in the seclusion of the vicarage grounds, and my own poor domestic pets, who supply the place of those sons and daughters that have *not* been born to me, must be chained up and not permitted to take their walks abroad, lest they should afford pleasure to me, or I to them.

Now, sir, in reply to the question, Is pleasure sinful? I think I have given good and sufficient reason for declaring that it is no more sinful because its abuse is unlawful than marriage is a failure because some men—not excepting the sprigs of nobility—neglect their wives, and some women—not labourers' wives only—neglect their husbands' comforts, and so drive them into more congenial society.

YOUR CONTRIBUTOR.

HEARING IN CHURCHES.

SIR,—The difficulty of hearing well in some of the churches is a subject I believe we must admit of very great importance, and perhaps you will kindly permit me to bring attention to it by means of your columns. It is true some of the churches are of a great length; however, I do not think that this is altogether the cause of the defect, for I recollect upon one occasion in attending a church service to have sat about half way up the building, and still I could hear very little of the sermon. Now, I have noticed in a church where it is difficult to hear the clergyman when he speaks from the lectern and the pulpit, his words are clearly audible from the communion table; that is when his face is turned towards the congregation. How I endeavour to account for the difference is thus: the chancel being ceiled prevents the sound of the voice ascending to a great extent among the rafters of the structure. And if the experiment were tried, to place the lectern and the pulpit well under a ceiled roof the acoustic properties of many churches might be greatly improved, much to the true edification of their congregations.

J. T. DOCKER.

Bournemouth, July 9th, 1890.

WHO TAKES SCRIPTURE LITERALLY?

SIR,—Pray allow me to make a few remarks on Mr. E. Lawrence's letter of the 12th ult. He says, "Certainly if Christ's Flesh, which He gave for the life of the world (v. 51), which Flesh (same verse) is the living bread which came down out of heaven, be Christ's Divinity, the literal meaning fails."

Now I fail to understand how Mr. Lawrence says, "which Flesh (same verse) is the living bread which came down out of heaven." Our Lord does not say so. He says, "I am the living bread"; and what He says He will give for the life of the world is His Flesh, which He calls here "bread." Surely Mr. Lawrence does not imagine that our Lord would have His hearers believe that His Flesh was Himself! There must be, at least so it seems, a distinction between our Lord's Godhead and His Manhood; between His Divinity and that body which He assumed and gave for the life of the world. This Flesh, which He gave, He calls "bread." And He also says, "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath everlasting life"; but still even so, we are not therefore to conclude that this bread is the same as the living bread which came down out of heaven, or "the bread of God" mentioned in the 33rd verse.

Eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood is simply belief in the efficacy of the atoning sacrifice of that Flesh and Blood. Whether this chapter has reference to the Holy Communion or not, is another matter altogether. But the point which Canon Crosthwaite makes, and Mr. Lawrence attacks, is, that our Lord's Flesh and Blood did *not* come down from heaven, and therefore we cannot attach the same meaning to the word "bread" throughout this chapter.

INQUIRENS.

THE SO-CALLED MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—In my last letter I said: "On scrutinising the 390 words in the body of Dr. Hobart's work, for which definite medical references are given, we find that 40 are peculiar (among the medical writers) to Galen, and may therefore be at once struck out, as being not found in any medical writings till 100 years or so after Luke's time. Of the remaining 350 words, no less than 315 are used by the great Hippocrates."

Out of the whole list of words in Dr. Hobart's Index (over 400 in number) *only twenty-five* are used by *all the four* medical writers. *Not one single word* is peculiar to the author of the Third Gospel, and to *both* of the two medical writers nearest to him in point of time—Aretæus and Dioscorides. *Only one word* is peculiar to the former and to the writer of the Third Gospel, and that one word occurs in the LXX. *Only three words* are peculiar to Dioscorides and the writer of the Third Gospel, and one of these occurs in a phrase obviously taken from the very first book in the LXX.

There are *only five* words peculiar to the author of the Third Gospel and to *all the three* medical writers—Aretæus, Dioscorides, and Galen. How can Dr. Hobart possibly reconcile all these facts and figures with his fundamental assumption of a technical medical language "particularly conservative in its character."

And if Dr. Hobart's proof, drawn from the words proves to be such a broken reed, what shall we say about the phrases. Alas! for Dr. Hobart's assumption, there is literally only ONE (so-called) medical phrase which is *used by all the four* medical writers. And what is that one? Why, just the simple natural expression *oil and wine*, ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνος, which occurs more than once in the Septuagint (Numbers xviii. 12; Deut. vii. 13; Ps. civ. 15; Haggai i. 11), and is not peculiar to the Third Gospel even among the New Testament writings (Rev. vi. 6; xviii. 13). Moreover the complete phrase in Luke x. includes the word ἐπιχέειν; and ἐπιχέειν with ἔλαιον is used in the account of Aaron's consecration with which every Jew was naturally familiar (Lev. viii. 12). This same phrase ἐπιχέειν with ἔλαιον is found twice besides, in Leviticus (Lev. ii. 15; v. 11).

Two phrases occur in *three* out of the four medical writers, namely, ὕπνος βαθύς; but this is found also in the Septuagint (Ecclus. xxii. 7); and θρόμβοι αἵματος, which is not the exclusive property of the doctors, being also used by Æschylus and Plato. The common expressions συλλαμβάνειν ἐν γαστρι, ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν,

ῥύσις αἵματος, which are used by both Hippocrates and Galen, are found in the early books of the lxx (Gen. xxv. 21 ; xvi. 4 ; Lev. xx. 18). The expression ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν also is found several times in the New Testament, being used by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Paul, and St. John.

Though Hippocrates and Galen both use the present participle of the verb ἔνειμι they do not uppear to use it in the same sense τὰ ἐνόντα (in Luke xi. 41) property, and in this sense Plato uses the expression. A fourth phrase of theirs κατὰ λόγον occurs in Herodotus and Xenophon. The expression οὐδὲν ἄτοπον, also found in Hippocrates and Galen, is used by the writer of the Third Gospel in connection with πράσσειν (Luke xxiii. 41), and this very phrase οὐδὲν ἄτοπον πράσσειν is to be found word for word in Prov. xxx. 20, and 2 Macc. xiv. 23 ; μηδὲν ἄτοπον occurs again in Acts xxviii. 6. Let me here quote a remark of Grinfield (on the Septuagint, p. 164): "So nearly do some chapters of the Maccabees approach to the diction of others in the Acts of the Apostles, that, if it were not for the subject, but little difference could be found between them." We need not, therefore, call in the doctors to account for the presence of this expression.

Neither this nor the two preceding phrases I have mentioned have anything specially medical about them. Dr. Hobart (p. 62) calls προσψαύειν τῷ δακτύλῳ (Luke xi. 46) "a technical medical term"; but he gives no single instance of this precise phrase in all his quotations from the medical writers. It appears, however, that both Hippocrates and Galen use ψαύειν τῷ δακτύλῳ ; but, then, ψαύειν is a very common word, found in *Homer*, *Pindar*, *Herodotus*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Xenophon*, *Polibius*; and if one ever wants to touch anything, certainly the finger (δακτυλος) seems, not only very handy, but the natural instrument for the purpose. How can "to touch with the finger" be a "technical medical term"? The identical compound word, προσψαυειν, is used both by Pindar and Sophocles, but among the medical writers only by Galen (in the second century) long *after* the date of the Acts. Galen alone has ἀρχὴ ὀθονῆς, but as Hippocrates has the very similar ἀρχὴ ὀθονίου, I will consider the expression more fully later on. The phrase, μέγας πυρετός, occurs only in Galen, but since Aretæus speaks of σμικρὸς πυρετός, I will, in another letter, discuss this also, together with two or three phrases which are used *only* by some *one* of the four medical writers appealed to. I have already mentioned that Bleek denies that μέγας πυρετός is a medical expression.

With the exception of βλάπτειν, used with the negative, μηδέν (which, not being a specifically medical phrase, could not have been confined to the doctor's βλάπτειν, is found in 2 Maccabees), there is, I believe, strictly speaking, no other phrase which is used by more than *one* of the medical writers. And as there are no phrases (besides the two or three mentioned above) which are found in either Aretæus or Dioscorides ; there will only remain for consideration one or two expressions used solely by Hippocrates, or else used solely by Galen. Any word or phrase used by Galen alone cannot possibly be taken as a proof of technical medical language *a century earlier* in the time of the Acts ; while any word or phrase used by Hippocrates nearly *five centuries* before the Christian era naturally passed into the common and current phraseology of later Greek, because the Ionic dialect, in which he wrote, was the backbone of the Greek languague for a thousand years, from the time of Homer to certainly the close of the Apostolic age.

The earliest prose, as well as poetry, was written, as I have pointed out, in the Ionic dialect. The old Ionic, in which Homer wrote, differed little, if at all, from the old Attic. The Attic dialect was the language of the tragedians, orators, historians, philosophers—the language of Sophocles, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Plato. And the Attic was also the basis of that "common dialect" which after Alexander's time came into general use, and of which the Hellenistic Greek of the Septuagint and the New Testament was a special and Jewish development. Hippocrates being (with Herodotus) the standard writer in Ionic, a great number of his words would necessarily be preserved and incorporated in this later Greek, and would naturally pass into the Hellenistic Greek of the Septuagint, and from thence inevitably into the writings of the New Testament. This is just what we find to be the case.

Dr. Hobart's technical medical language, "particularly conservative in its character," turns out to be no technical medical language at all ; but simply a number of single words which, being used by Hippocrates (the earliest writer on medicine), became, as I have said, part and parcel of ordinary Greek phraseology, and passed into general use.

Two or three other medical authors, writing several centuries after Hippocrates, were of course not forbidden the use of the current Greek of their age, and they would doubtless read up the Patriarch Hippocrates before venturing to offer any opinion of their own on medical matters.

Dr. Hobart's great assumption of a technical medical language, "from the time of Hippocrates to that of Galen," is thus shown to be without foundation, and to be contrary to the ascertained facts.

H. HEBER EVANS.

July 25th, 1890.

BURIAL REFORM AND THE PRINCE OF WALES.—Bishop Barry, presiding at the 12th Annual Meeting of the Church of England Burial Reform Association, held last week in Sion College, London, read the following letter from Sir Francis Knollys, on behalf of the Prince of Wales, addressed to the Rev. F. Lawrence, Hon. Sec., Vicar of Westow, York:—"I am desired by His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, to acknowledge the receipt of your communication, and to state, in reply, that he trusts the burial reform advocated by your Society may be speedily carried into effect, and that, in view of the rapidly-increasing population of the kingdom, the present system of burying the dead may be exchanged for one more in accordance with the requirements of the age and the sanitary interests of the community." The Bishop continued that, as reflecting the general interest taken in this subject, letters expressing approval of the objects of the Association, and regretting inability to attend, had been received from the Duke of Westminster, Earl Aberdeen, Viscount Sidmouth, and many others. The Bishop said that the Society directed its efforts against costly and insanitary burial as also against undue ceremonial, knowing that the body which was laid into the earth was not that which would be raised hereafter. The Hon. Secretary stated, on the authority of Mr. Byron Reed, M.P., that the Government had acceded to the application made by this Society for returns respecting the cemeteries of Leeds, Sheffield, and other large towns similar to those issued at the instance of this Society respecting the London

cemeteries. Earl Fortescue proposed, Mr. J. Munby, of York, Hon. Treasurer, seconded, and General Lowry, C.B., supported the adoption of the Report. The following resolutions respectively were proposed and seconded by Professor Flower, C.B., President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Edward Seaton, Mr. F. J. Gant, F.R.C.S., ex-President of the Medical Society of London, Dr. Norman Kerr, Lieut.-Col. Everitt, and the Rev. W. Lach-Syrma, and were carried unanimously: "That the true principle for the disposal of the dead body lies in providing against its becoming injurious to the living, and that when buried it should be enclosed in a perishable coffin, and laid into sufficient and suitable earth." "That the Government be memorialized to concentrate in the Local Government Board the control over burial-places now divided between that Board and the Home Office," and "That the formation of Burial Guilds, whereby the dead can be buried Christianly and inexpensively is much to be desired." Upon a statement being made, and confirmed, that from seventy to ninety bodies had been laid one upon another in one pit in the Tower Hamlets Cemeteries, and that since this practice had been discontinued scant regard had been paid to the orders in Council, an additional resolution was moved by the Archdeacon of Gloucester, seconded by Dr. Edwin Haward, and carried *nem. con.*, to the effect that a petition be presented to Parliament, urging an inquiry into the dangers attendant upon the excessive over-crowding in the London cemeteries. To an inquiry from the Archdeacon if underground cremation was not possible, it was authoritatively stated that the earth is a natural crematory, and that the air, if it have unimpeded access, purifies and disintegrates the body, leaving nothing behind after three to seven years, except organic matter. The Archdeacon said that he would introduce the subject into his next charge. It was announced that the Bishop of Wakefield and Professor Flower, C.B., had consented to be joint Chairmen of the Council for the ensuing year, the Dean of York continuing Chairman of the Executive. An urgent appeal was made for funds, which are much needed.

AN announcement has been made public of a handsome donation of 3,000*l.* which has been given by Miss Steel for the promotion of theological studies in Cambridge. The Regius Professor of Divinity and the Ely Professor and a co-opted trustee will have the power of electing to three studentships, one of the annual value of 50*l.*, another of 40*l.*, and another of 30*l.* It is expected that the first election will take place next summer. The suggested regulations, which show a wise amount of flexibility, contain the following provisions:—Candidates must be at least twenty-one years of age, and must (generally speaking) have passed in honours for the B.A. degree. Those will be selected who are, in the judgment of the trustees, the best fitted for entering at once on a course of definite preparation for holy orders at the University and likely to be devoted and useful in parochial or missionary work. Each student shall be under the direction of the Regius Professor of Divinity (or such other person as he and the other trustees may appoint), who will prescribe what lectures, etc., the student should attend, and place him under the superintendence of one of the parochial clergy of Cambridge or the neighbourhood for the purpose of gaining instruction in the various branches of parochial work. Reports of the conduct and progress of the students will be transmitted by the parochial clergyman superintending each student to the director of their studies and shall be forwarded by him (with a report on the rest of their work) to the trustees at the end of every academical year. The course will be for one or two years, as the trustees shall decide in each particular case. Every student shall be required to pass (before the close of his course) "The Preliminary Examination of Candidates for Holy Orders," or some other theological examination at the discretion of the trustees.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Austen, Rev. E. G., M.A., Rector of Penselwood; Assistant Inspector of Schools in the Rural Deanery of Bruton.
Bickmore, Rev. F. A., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Lambeth; Rector of Leigh, near Worcester.
Brameld, Rev. Canon W. A., M.A., Principal of St. Paul's Missionary College, Burgh; Vicar of Wortley, Leeds.
Browning, Rev. G. A., Curate of All Saints', Margaret-street; Rector of Turweston, near Brackley, Bucks, in the Diocese of Oxford.
Buckland, Rev. A. R., M.A., Morning Preacher at the Foundling Hospital.
Buller, Rev. Prebendary W. E., M.A., Vicar of Chard; Vicar of North Curry.
Clare, Rev. J. B., Vicar of Wenhaston, Suffolk.
Clutterbuck, Rev. R. H., Rector of Penton Mewsey, Hants.
Coulson, Rev. A. B., B.A., Vicar of Carham, near Coldstream; Vicar of Branxton, Northumberland.
Fowler, Rev. John Cowley, B.A., Vicar of Whorlton-in-Cleveland, Northallerton.
Fraser-Frizell, Rev. R., Rector of St. Allen's, Truro; Vicar of Chacewater, Cornwall.
Hands, Rev. Thomas, Curate of Hinckley, Leicestershire; Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Northampton.
Knowling, Rev. R. J., M.A., Chaplain; Vice-Principal of King's College, London.
M'Neile, Rev. Hector, M.A., Diocesan School Inspector, Manchester; Vicar of Pott Shrigley, near Macclesfield.
Meadows, Rev. R. R., B.A., Rector of Thurning, Norfolk.
Purvis, Rev. T. A., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. John's, Dorman's Land, Surrey.
Spokes, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Long Sutton, Lincolnshire; Vicar of Weston St. Mary, Spalding.
Stent, Rev. William Herbert, Vicar of Fleet, Dorset.
Taunton, Rev. C. W. S., Curate of Boconnoc; Vicar of Mylor, Cornwall.
Whitaker, Rev. Alfred Master, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Whitehead, Rev. H., M.A., Vicar of Newton-Reigny, Penrith; Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Lanercost, Cumberland.
Whitehead, Rev. Thomas Henry, Rector of Donnington, Herefordshire.
Wilson, Rev. J. M., M.A., Head Master of Clifton College; Vicar of Rochdale and Archdeacon of Manchester.
Wimberley, Rev. C. F. A., B.A., Senior Assistant-Master at Llandaff Cathedral School; Head Master of the Choir School and Precentor of Hull.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Davies, Rev. Edward, late Rector of Himley, Staffordshire, at Himley Lodge, Pennfields, on the 25th inst.
Eyre, Rev. Henry Samuel, at Finchley Road, London, on the 26th inst., aged 74 years.
Grant, Rev. James, D.D., D.C.L. Oxon., etc., late Minister of St. Mary's, Edinburgh, at 15, Palmerston Place, Edinburgh, on the 28th inst., aged 90 years.
Havergal, Rev. Francis Tebbs, D.D., New College, Oxford, Vicar of Upton Bishop, Sub-Treasurer and Prebendary of Colwall in Hereford Cathedral, at Upton Bishop Vicarage, Ross, on the 27th inst., aged 60 years.
Kingsford, Rev. Sampson, M.A., Vicar of St. Hilary, Cornwall, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, at Wood, Okehampton, on the 26th inst., aged 64 years.
Smedley, Rev. E. A., late Vicar of Chesterton, Cambridge, at Little Shelford, Cambridge, on the 22nd inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

A SILENT GOD.

By the Ven. Archdeacon FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, July 20, 1890.

"And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets."—1 Samuel xxviii. 6.

WE have recently been hearing in our Sunday lessons the thrilling and painfully-instructive history of Saul, the first king of Israel. In all the range of history I know no deeper tragedy than the story of that unhappy king, so enviable in the dawn of his prosperity, so ruined and deeply to be compassionated in his decline. What youth of Israel did not envy him? What maiden of Israel would not have loved him when he stood a head taller than the shouting multitude—modest, manly, magnanimous—on the day of his anointing? What meanest hind who begged his bread would have exchanged lots with him when he crept disguised at midnight round the hillside to the witch's cave? What an hour was that of shame and of anguish! The king, who had stood every inch a king, his mighty javelin in his hand, under the pomegranate at Migron—the king who had clothed the virgins of Israel with scarlet and other delights, and put ornaments of gold upon their apparel—that king, discrowned and ghastly pale, is driven by despair to learn the secrets of heaven from the sorceress of hell. And when in the cavern of the woman with a familiar spirit, whom, in happier days, he would have executed, he heard the messages of doom from the ghostly lips of the prophet who had been the friend of his youth, and might have been the glory of his reign, there was a clang upon the rocky floor as he swooned away and fell, straightway, his full length upon the earth; or, as it is expressed in the literal pathos of the original, he made haste to fall with the fulness of his stature. How did the sun which had risen in glory go down while it yet was day! Next morning the battle went against him. He was sorely wounded by the archers. The tide of the carnage of Israel rolled towards him from the barren heights of Gilboa. Dizzy and in anguish, he stood there, his garments rolled in blood, listening to the terror of the rout as he lent on his once victorious spear. His people were defeated. His brave sons were slain. What was life to him any longer? Since his faithful armour-bearer would not slay him, he fell on his own sword:—

> In the lost battle,
> Borne down by the flying,
> Where mingles war's rattle
> With groans of the dying,
> There shall he be lying.

Then came the foul Amalekite, the plunderer of the slain, and tore the crown from the kingly forehead, and the bracelet from the arm, and all that remained of the beauty of Israel slain on her high places was a grinning skull among Dagon's trophies, a suit of riven armour in the temple of Ashtaroth, and white bones bleaching in the fierce sunlight on Bethshan's wall.

And yet, in all that long tragedy, this incident, "And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets," seems to me to be the most tragic verse. Calamity may be borne. We can oppose to it our manhood and our constancy. Menaced by shipwreck, we can breast the storm. We have learnt by all our experience that earthly hopes have precarious life. They are oft blighted, withered, snapped sheer off in vigorous growth, and turned to rottenness. But faithfulness can feed on suffering, and knows no disappointment. To be defeated in battle, to be superseded in power, to see popularity crumbling into indifference, and affection changed into ill-will, to watch the rise of another on his own ruin, to feel that his day was over and his work done, to experience that great sinking of the heart which is caused by the sense of failure after honourable effort—all this and more Saul had to bear, and all this may be borne. But to be left in utterness of perplexity, to stagger in blindness towards the awful unknown precipice, to have his prayers, as it were, flung back in his face unregarded, to feel as if God cared not at all for him any longer—that was an anguish worse than death. My friends, so long as God is with us, so long as, groping blindly through the darkness, we can find His hand, all is well with us, however ill it may be. To suffer with Christ is not to suffer. Another Saul—Saul of Tarsus, "who also is called Paul"—endured all this. His friends were ashamed of him and did not visit him. All they of Asia deserted him. All the numberless blessings which he had tried to bestow upon men in that life of unselfish kindness seemed to have fallen like unheeded raindrops into some silent sea of oblivion. His death was so utterly lonely that no friend seems to have even seen the axe flash which shore away his life. Yet that Saul of Tarsus, the Apostle Paul, was supremely happy, and a joy kindling to exultation is the key-note even of his prison letters. Why? Because "if God be with us, none can be against us." "If God be on my side," any one may say to all the world, "I care nothing for all the rest." Let corrupt churches anathematise, and priests torture,

and inquisitors burn, and mobs howl, and a venal press lie and slander, as many a time ere now they have anathematised and tortured and burnt and execrated and slandered the best of the saints of God. They may hurt our bodies, they may pain our minds, but us ourselves, our essential spirits, they cannot reach or even touch. "Whoso dwelleth in the shadow of the Most High shall abide under the wings of the Almighty." Did not great Martin Luther cry: "O my God, punish me rather with pestilence, with all the terrible sicknesses on earth, with war, with anything, rather than Thou be silent to me"? "And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not." Ah! that is to be desolate indeed!

There are some whom God does not answer because they do not care to inquire of Him at all. The earth suffices them. Life is their feeding trough, and they care nothing for more. They never care to look beyond the narrow horizon of themselves. The man who is all his life the abject slave of his ledger and his counting-house, and who has no god but gold—the man who cares for nothing but self and success and display—the man who lives for the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, content with the swirling emptiness and scandalous frivolity of the thing that calls itself "Society," the evil man, and the seducer, and the man who, for gain, steeps himself in trades which involve the criminal assassination of the souls and bodies of his fellow-men; the youth who in selfish indolence and effeminate vanity consumes all that is noble within him in the smouldering fires of his own passions—oh, it is not till God has brought them into some narrow place where there is no turning, and the angel of vengeance stands before them with his drawn sword in his hand, that such souls as these, "earthly, sensual, devilish," begin to feel what it is to have no hope and to be without God in the world. Their teaching is in God's hands.

But I am speaking to men and women of whom most, I suppose, sincerely desire to lead Christian lives, and, I ask, Is there any one of you who has experienced, or who is now experiencing, what it is to suffer under that awful sense of desolation which is described in Scripture as the hiding of God's countenance? When Saul inquired of the Lord, we are told that the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets. Dreams were the lowest form of revelation, and though of old, God did speak sometimes in visions to His saints, and though sometimes the sleeping mind is bright with eyes, yet we have so many closer modes of communion with God, in His Christ and by His Spirit, that of dreams we need not speak. But what was the Urim? The exact way in which the high priest ascertained the will of God by the jewelled breastplate which was called the Urim and Thummim, or light and revelation, is not known. One theory is that a mystic light stole over the names graven on those oracular gems, and spelled out the required answer. And has no mystic light ever gleamed for you over the words which came to you from God, as under some intense mysterious illumination? Have not messages of Scripture, for instance, ever seemed suddenly to burn their revelation upon your souls? Perhaps you have heard or read a text a thousand times, and it has been nothing to you till, in one instant, it has leapt and flamed into eternal meaning.

> "Sudden, 'midst our idle chorus,
> O'er our sins Thy thunders roll;
> Death his signal waves before us,
> Night and terror take the soul,
> Till, through double darkness round us,
> Looks a star,
> And Thou hast found us."

So it was that St. Francis of Assisi was seized by the text, "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor." So it was that to St. Francis Xavier the words, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul," shone forth in letters of unimaginable fire." So it was that to John Bunyan the description of the day of the Lord suddenly became lurid with an awful light. And I knew a boy to whom once in boyhood gleamed out the words, "He shall be like unto the grass upon the housetops, wherewith the mower filleth not his hand, nor he that gathereth the sheaves to his bosom," and to whom, henceforth, as a picture of utter uselessness and worthlessness, those words became as an inspired effort to teach him to do his uttermost to avoid a life of total vileness. And another was saved by the words, "A living dog is better than a dead lion," when he remembered that, if all else was lost, life at least remained to him. And to another the light of the Urim fell on a sermon of which the text was the single word, "To-morrow." And another was converted by the single word "Eternity." He had been handed a tract in a railway train, and he had angrily torn it up; but a piece of paper with the one word "Eternity" upon it was left upon his coat, and as he brushed it off the word suddenly caught his eye, and flashed the light of heaven upon a wilful imagination and upon a slumbering conscience. And how many a ruined prodigal has been brought home by the words "I will arise and go to my Father"? And how many a remorseful penitent by the prayer of the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner"? Yes, God does speak to us by Urim still, and He also speaks to us by His prophets. There is not one good book you read, there is not one kind or faithful voice you hear, there is not one sermon to which you listen, which may not speak to you from God as with a prophet's voice. Ah, if God seems silent to you, may it not be that He has spoken but that you have not listened?—for it is not only by dreams and Urim and prophets that He speaks to us. God is speaking to us always and all day long. He speaks to

us from the sun of summer, and from the midnight stars.

Every bird that sings,
And every flower that gems the elastic sod,
And every breath the radiant summer brings,
To the pure spirit, is a word of God.

And He speaks to us by parents and by schoolmasters, and by rules of reason, and by the thousand pathetic pleading voices of an awakened, of a gnawing, of a reproving, of a warning, of an approving conscience. And have you not often been to these voices like the deaf adder which shutteth her ears, and burrows herself down to hide in her congenial mud, and will not hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely? Have there not been thousands of occasions when God has called to every one of you, and you have refused? He hath stretched out His hand, and ye have not regarded; and, when the good seed was being sown, has not your heart often been callous and hard, as a road trodden down by the hoofs of demons, or of swine? And can you wonder that the fowls of the air have carried the good seed away? And can you wonder that, if this be so, God, whom you have hated, God, whom you have despised, and whose laws you have deliberately and habitually violated, God, whose counsel you have set at nought and would none of His reproof, should not only be silent to you at last, not only turn away His face from you, but also, in the terrible language of Scripture, should "laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh as a desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish come upon you." Ah, my friends! that is an awful state, but it is never really so. The language only describes the petrifying result of our own hardened alienation. God never turns from the cry of the penitent, however bad he may have been. God "never willeth the death of a sinner, but rather than he should be converted and live." Distinguish, my friends, between God's apparent silences for His children, and the self-created silence of your own to those who utterly refuse and hate Him. The greatest saints of God, if you will read the most instructive of all forms of literature, the lives of the saints of God, have had at times what they call their seasons of dryness, when, for the time being, the heaven over their head has seemed to be as copper, and the earth under their feet as brass,—when, as they looked up to heaven, they seemed to be looking up at a vault of vapours, on an empty eye-socket, when it seemed as if the wings of their poor prayers beat in vain against the closed doors of heaven. But even in these dark hours, God's children still know and are sure that God has not deserted them—that the hiding of His countenance is but apparent and for the time. They know that "the clouds they so much dread are big with mercies," and that behind those clouds, however dark they seem, shines the sun of God, which is always in the meridian. To His children God may seem to be silent for a time, but He is not, and He cannot be silent long. He will turn again, and will deliver them. Earthly desertion, poverty, loneliness, neglect, sickness, bereavement, suffering, contempt, do not mean that God is distant from us. In yonder transept is the memorial of the great Puritan poet who endured them all, and, though fallen on evil days and evil tongues in darkness, and with dangers compassed round in *solitude*, he was able to write

I argue not 'gainst heaven's hand or will,
Nor 'bate a jot of heart or hope
But still bear up and steer right onward.

And think how the other great poet whom last December we laid yonder in his hallowed grave, spoke to us in his last song:—

As one who never turned his back,
He marched breast forwards,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted.
Wrong would triumph. Held, we fall to rise,
Are baffled to fight better, sleep to wake.

I have no time, my friends, to work out this subject fully now; only I would fain try to help you to feel how awful a thing is God's silence at the best, and yet how different a thing it is to those who do not love and fear, and to those who do. Have you read the experiences of that great explorer who last week was wedded here among so many thousands of well-wishers? Could a man be brought to lower depths of anguish than he was at Starvation Camp, in the boundless forest of darkest Africa? "Vain was it for me," he said, "to seek the sleep which is the balm of hurt minds. Too many memories crowded about me; too many dying faces haunted me in the darkness. The stark forms lying along the path were things too solemn for sudden oblivion. The poor hearts around me were too heavy for aught save groans of despair. The fires were not lit, for there was no food to cook. Out of the dull black darkness came the eerie shapes that haunt the fever land, that gibe and mock the lonely man, and weave figures of flame, and draw fiery forms in the mantle of the night; and a demon hinted in the dazed brain that it were better to rest than to think with a sickening heart; and the sough of the winds through the crown of the thick black bush seemed to sigh and moan to me, 'Lost! Lost! Thy labour and grief are in vain. Comfortless days upon days, brave lives are sobbing their last around thee. Man after man they roll down to death, and thou wilt be left alone.'" Did not God seem to be utterly silent to him at that dark moment, and to answer him "neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." Now note the sequel. When the poet Wordsworth tells the tale how the weeping mother found comfort in prayer, he says:—

Oh, there is never sorrow of heart
That shall lack a timely end,
If but to God we turn and ask
Of Him to be our friend.

And so H. M. Stanley found, for, as he sat almost

stupefied with misery through the gloom, there rang from a man with a despairing heart, the cry, "Allah Akbar!" ("God is great"), and as the words pealed through the darkness they roused the echoes in his own heart, and he says, "Why should a Moslem recall to a Christian the thoughts of his God? 'Oh, ye fools, when will ye be wise? He that planted the ear shall He not hear, and He that formed the eye shall He not see'? And, lo, worthier thoughts possessed me. The straining of the eyes through the darkness was relaxed, and the sight was turned inward to see dumb witnesses of past mercies on this or that forgotten occasion. One memory begets another, till the stubborn heart is melted, and our needs are laid as on a tablet before the great Deliverer." Yes, he prayed, and the very next morning the deliverance came. In a second of time the weak, the lame, the crippled, and limping and moaning people forgot their grief, and shouted the grateful chant which rises up of its own accord from full hearts, "Thanks be to God." Englishmen and Africans, Christians and Pagans, all alike realised Him—all alike confessed Him. He is not here or there, but everywhere, and the heart of the grateful man confesses Him; and, in due time, spectres of men cowering in the rainy gloom, shivering with cold, gaunt and sad-eyed through hunger, despairing in the midst of the unknown, with memories of the thunder crashing and rushing in rolling echoes through the silence and the darkness of the eternal forest, were succeeded by the fragrance of flowers, and the lustre of bedewed verdure, and the sheen of wet foliage, and the swirling swathes of the wet grass waltzing merrily with the gale, and mighty lakes and waters tumbling down in sheathes of silver arrows, and the delightful azure of the Indian Ocean; and though for a time God seemed to have been so silent to him, the glad traveller could end his records with the words "Thanks be to God for ever and ever, Amen." There, my friends, is a contemporary record and a contemporary lesson for you. If you be faithful—if, having been some time unfaithful you now be truly penitent, we bid you hope. God's silence shall soon be broken by voices of blessing. Though the hour seem dark to any one of you, He will return and save you.

I have no time for more now. Why God ever seems to be silent to any of those who with all their hearts truly seek Him, is one of the many mysteries of which we can but wait the solution beyond the grave; only we know that there is an infinite and eternal solution to that problem when we listen to that cry upon the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me"? But, oh, let us beware lest we feel the awful silence which is not God's, but arises from our own obstinate and determined wickedness, that it may not overwhelm us. Let every one of us bow our knees to God in prayer this night and this moment, with all our hearts, that He may have pity upon us, that He may bow down His ear and listen to our cry, that He may take away from us the heart of stone and give us the heart of flesh. Then we shall fear nothing. Then even death will come to us as an angel and a friend, and we shall learn to say

> Whatever discipline Thy will ordain,
> For the brief course which must for me remain,
> Teach me with quick-eared spirit to rejoice,
> In admonitions of Thy softest voice.
> Glad through a perfect love, a faith sincere,
> Drawn from the wisdom that begins with fear;
> Glad to expand, and for a season free
> From finite cares, to rest absorbed in Thee.

IRISH PROTESTANTISM.

By the Rev. J. W. KAYE, M.A., Rector of Derrybrusk, Enniskillen.

Sermon Preached in Derrybrusk Church on Sunday, July 6th, 1890.

"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy (schism), so worship I the God of our fathers, believing all things which are according to the law and which are written in the Prophets."—Acts xxiv. 14.

TO-DAY I am to speak to you concerning that faith, that "way which they call heresy," or schism.

This faith—the Protestant faith—is the faith of our forefathers, which we desire to preserve untainted and unsullied from generation to generation, that we may hand down to our successors the glorious privilege and God-given right to worship the God of our fathers in quietness and unassailed.

And we would "so worship the God of our fathers," that it may be manifest that we believe "all things which are according to the law, and which are written in the prophets"; and that we hope for the fulfilment of the things promised therein.

We believe that our Protestant faith comprehends all the essential facts of true Christianity, which includes within itself the full development and completion of the ancient Mosaic economy.

The God of our fathers is our God—the eternal Source and Fountain of light and life and love; who manifested His beneficence and glory in the Person and gift of His Incarnate Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

For this faith our forefathers sacrificed their lives; in this faith they lived and died, and God helping us, we too will live and die in this faith and defend to the last that sacred liberty which we have inherited—"freedom to worship God."

We desire to be preserved from all bigotry and from all ostentatious boasting in the profession of our Protestant faith. We would not blow the trumpet to proclaim our self-righteousness; neither would we hide our light under a bushel; but modestly we would "let our light shine before men."

We would let our quiet, upright and godly lives be our argument for the truth and beauty of our Protestant religion. We would be "living epistles of Christ, read and known of all men." We would pray for our enemies; we would bless and curse not.

These are the doctrines and principles which our forefathers taught and maintained, and which we also profess before the world. Yet concerning this faith we know that:—

I. It is a "way called heresy," or schism. "After the way that they call heresy (schism) so worship I," etc.

St. Paul had been led to see the errors and false assumptions of the Pharisees; and when his eyes were opened he renounced their burdensome traditions and embraced the simple Gospel of Christ.

Their religion had become overrun with multiplied ceremonies and formalities; and their foolish traditions had been allowed to usurp the authority of "the law and the prophets."

Yet St. Paul was denounced and persecuted as a schismatic, because he protested against these grievous burdens, false traditions, and worthless ceremonial formalities.

Our forefathers rejected the vain traditions and erroneous teachings of the Church of Rome, that they might bequeath to us the unadulterated Gospel of Christ. And for this their faithfulness they were condemned and tortured as heretics and schismatics.

Let no one think that what things they protested against were mere matters of opinion and non-essentials in religion, for they included the very foundation-truths of civil and religious liberty.

Let us for a few moments recall some of the historical facts connected with the Irish Church. And first of all our Church claims an origin entirely independent of the Church of Rome. The earliest Christian writers of Ireland ascribe the introduction of Christianity to the disciples of St. John.* Bishop Polycarp was ordained by the hands of St. John, while Pothinus and Irenæus were disciples of Polycarp, and were sent as missionaries to France, the ancient Gaul. Here they established mission stations at Lyons and Vienne, and thence they carried the Gospel to Britain from the Clyde in the north to Canterbury in the south.

On the banks of the Clyde St. Patrick was taught as a youth the Christian faith; his father a deacon, and his grandfather a presbyter of the Church. From thence he was stolen as a slave to tend his master's sheep on the hills and in the valleys of Ireland. He escaped from his captivity, and may have gone back to Scotland, but being desirous of carrying the Gospel to Ireland he made his way to France for instruction. After some years of preparation he received ordination as deacon, presbyter and bishop at the hands of St. Germane, of Auxerre, and not from the Church of Rome.

With true apostolic devotion he returned to Ireland, and preached the Gospel from the north to the south, baptizing, planting churches, and ordaining deacons, presbyters, and bishops.

Thus the whole country became Christianised and independent of the Church of Rome—tracing back its origin to St. John and his disciples. From the year 430 A.D. till 1100, Christianity flourished, and Ireland became "the Island of Saints," and sent its missionaries to various parts of Europe. By-and-bye the numerous clans and independent chiefs by their constant feuds, and almost barbaric warfare, reduced the religion of the land to a miserably low ebb.

A vanquished chief appealed to the King of England for help, and, under various pretexts, Henry II. brought his armies to Ireland, when the chiefs submitted to his rule, and the bishops agreed to religious union with the English Church. To suit his own private ends Henry II. now handed over the Irish Church to the Pope of Rome. Schism was thus introduced into the Irish Church, and bishops and priests were appointed by order of the Roman Pontiff.

Pope Celestine sent Palladius to England and Ireland before St. Patrick entered on his mission, but he returned in a few months and died shortly afterwards. But from the days of St. Patrick to the conquest of Henry II. the Irish Church was independent of Rome; then from 1171 to the Reformation the Papacy held sway. When Henry VIII. refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope he issued an ecclesiastical edict in Ireland, "that laymen and boys should not be admitted to ecclesiastical preferments," as had been the case under the Popes.

The Reformation proceeded apace, and Protestants increased in Ireland as elsewhere. Numerous rebellions were raised by the Romanists against England and the Protestants with bitter hatred; but in the reign of Queen Elizabeth the bishops of the Irish Church formally accepted the Reformation. Rebellion followed rebellion until the fate of the nation was decided at the siege of Derry and the Battle of the Boyne, when William III. made himself the unquestioned King of Ireland.

The Irish Church yet remains, though the Irish Parliament despoiled her of her tithes in 1735, and since then the English Parliament has robbed her of her endowments. Yet the Church of Rome pronounces us heretics. It is they who are the schismatics; they stole into the Irish Church in the days of Henry II. with schism, and they left it with schism at the Reformation.

Let us further remark concerning the Protestant faith that—

II. It is the "way" and faith of our fathers. "So worship I the God of our fathers." The Irish

* Cf. Steph. Vit. Wilfrid; and Bede, iii. 25.

Reformation was not the introduction of any new doctrine or dogma; it was simply the restoration of the ancient faith.

The Synod of Irish bishops in 1551 adopted the English Liturgy in place of the Latin Service Book. In 1560-1 a Synod was held for "establishing the Protestant religion" and confirming the Reformation. Twenty Irish bishops were present at the Irish Parliament in 1559-60, when Acts were passed for "restoring to the Crown its ancient jurisdiction," and for "uniformity in religious worship."

All the Irish bishops took the oath of supremacy, except two, who had been appointed to the Sees of Meath and Kildare by Queen Mary, herself a Romanist.

In the year 1566 the Irish bishops put forth twelve articles which were subscribed by the Irish clergy:—

1. The clergy declare their belief in the Articles, and call for the assent of their parishioners.
2. Belief in the Canonical Scriptures and the three Creeds.
3. That the Word of God is truly taught in the Church and the Sacraments duly administered.
4. The Queen's supremacy.
5. That the Bishop of Rome hath no authority over the See of any other bishop.
6. That the Pope's claim to be supreme head over the Universal Church of Christ is unscriptural.
7. The acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer.
8. That private masses are not agreeable to Christ's ordinance.
9. That Holy Communion must be administered in both kinds—bread and wine.
10. That the worship of images and relics is contrary to the commandments of God.
11. That all men should follow works of faith, as charity, mercy, alms, prayers and godly abstinence and fasting.
12. That we owe obedience to the Civil Government.

This is a summary of the "Articles" held by the Reformed Church of Ireland. For these doctrines and precepts our forefathers sacrificed their lives, counting themselves happy to hand down to us the ancient faith of the Church restored. The numerous accretions which the Church of Rome had added to the Creed of the Church they rejected. (1.) Prayers for the dead, though sanctioned by Gregory I., were not decreed in Council till (Florence) 1439. (2.) Purgatory was affirmed by Gregory I., but it was not decreed in Council till the same Council of Florence (1439). (3.) Extreme Unction (not St. James's) was not in use till the twelfth century. (4.) Auricular Confession was first mentioned in the Lateran Council (1215), but not decreed till the Council of Trent (Sess. xiv.), and from this Council came the authority for the Sacrament of Penance, with confession and absolution. (5.) Celibacy of the clergy was condemned by the Council of Nice (325), and bishops and clergy continued to marry till Gregory VII. enforced celibacy by severe penalties. St. Patrick's father and grandfather were both married clergy. (6.) Transubstantiation was condemned by the Council of Constantinople (680); but was introduced into the Lateran Council in 1215, and was decreed only by the Council of Trent (1551). (7.) The worship of the Blessed Virgin was not known in the early ages of the Church, and Cardinal Newman admits that it was left for the fifth century to adopt it. Another incrustation has been added recently—the Pope's infallibility, which we, as Protestants, are not likely to accept.

As Protestants we reject these errors; they belonged not to the faith of the ancient Church, and we will not receive them.

Concerning our Protestant faith we affirm that—

III. It is founded on the written Word of God. "Believing all things which are according to the law, and which are written in the prophets." Upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament we take our stand, and "any doctrine that is not contained therein, nor can be proved thereby," we claim the right to reject.

What, then, is the Protestant faith? It is the faith of the Bible, and of the Bible alone. In matters that are indifferent or unrevealed, we are willing to accept the customs and usages of the Church, and submit ourselves to its authority.

How long we shall be allowed these privileges we cannot tell; we may be called upon to defend our faith as our fathers did.

But if such perilous times should come (which God forbid) who will be found faithful? The best Christians will be found the best defenders of the faith. Our Church is passing through a great crisis, and many of our able supporters are being driven from our help by our enemies.

It is to you, young men and young women—it is to you, fathers and mothers—the Protestants of Ireland, that the Church is looking for help.

If your hearts are true, if your souls are faithful, you cannot be indifferent to the Church of your fathers. Your enemies will seize every opportunity to ensnare and drive out your clergy, and if you are not faithful to your Church you will be driven on the mountains as wandering sheep having no shepherd. "Who then is on the Lord's side?" Who will be faithful to our Church? Who will fight the Lord's battles? Look to your faith; look to your lives; look to your God. Let your hearts glow with zeal; let the love of Christ constrain you; let the language of your lips be, "As for me and for my house we will serve the Lord."

Let your lives bear witness to the truth and sincerity of your profession; pity those who are in

error, and pray for your enemies; but be ever ready to meet them.

We cannot shut our eyes to the facts of history, nor to the terrible crimes that are happening around us. Many are trembling for the future of our Church—for the future of the Protestant faith in Ireland. Will you be faithful—more devoted than ever? I fear there is need to tremble for the ark of our Israel. Shall I take you to the battle-field to see the sufferings of your forefathers? Will you look on the famine and starvation inside the walls of Derry? Will you gaze on the blood-red slaughter at the Boyne? It cost all this and more to purchase the liberty you now enjoy.

I know that your hearts quiver with sorrow and pity for the sufferings and death of those faithful men. And I know that with the help of God you will strive to be faithful also. The Lord give you grace and strength and keep you faithful unto death; that yours may be the crown of life and yours the eternal weight of glory.

THE Rev. J. Hamer Rawdon, M.A., Vicar and Rural Dean of Preston, has been appointed by the Bishop of Manchester Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral.

TUESDAY, 29th ult, was Speech-day at Oakham School. At the service the sermon was preached by Archdeacon Woolley, an old Oakhamian. The hereditary patron presided at the prize-giving, and the prizes were distributed by the Bishop of Leicester. Allusion was made to the opening of a new wing, which will be ready for use next term, and to First Classes in the Classical Tripos gained for four years in succession.

APPOSITION was held at St. Paul's School on last Wednesday week. In opening the proceedings, the High Master, the Rev. F. W. Walker, referred to the great improvement in the relations between masters and boys, which he had noticed of late years in all the schools of the country. He also dwelt upon the advantage of combining a practical modern education with the classical course, his opinion being that a short annual residence abroad was of great value, not only in enabling boys to acquire facility in the languages of foreign countries, but in enlarging their views on all subjects. The honours gained by past and present Paulines during the last twelve months include the Gaisford, Newdigate, and Chancellor's prizes at Oxford, and the Chancellor's Medal at Cambridge. Fifteen scholarships at the Universities had been gained, six boys had passed the India Civil Service examination, and numerous admissions to Woolwich and Sandhurst had been obtained. A commemoration of the founder, Dean Colet, and of the benefits conferred by him and by the executors and augmentors of his bounty, the Mercers' Company, on all who had received their education at St. Paul's, was read by the captain of the school, Bailey, after which Mr. Clementi Smith, the Master of the Mercers' Company, distributed the prizes. Then followed selections from various plays in several languages. In the evening a conversazione was held at the school.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1890.

THE CLERGY PENSION FUND.

(*Communicated.*)

"Do ye not know, that they who minister about Holy things, live of the sacrifice; and that they who wait at the altar are partakers with the altar."

IT has long been felt, that while other corporations have superannuation funds the Church of England is without one. Four years ago a great effort was made to start an Institution which should form rules and receive money to give clergy, who are aged or unable to work, the means of retiring. In these four years only £42,000 has been obtained, owing probably to the laity not understanding the claims the clergy have upon them. Our enemies try to show that the Church has enough funds of her own if only rightly divided, and exaggerate for this purpose her nominal income. Those who advise this division can be pardoned their ignorance in case they are willing to be corrected, but too often these objectors only wish for an excuse for not doing their duty, which may satisfy themselves, but will not satisfy God. As to our wealth, some years ago it was shown that, if all the money was equally divided, there would not be £200 a-year for every clergyman; and now that tithes and rents have fallen and the clergy have increased in numbers, how much less would be the result? To a very poor man with 12s. per week, £200 would seem enormous, but the poorest of men know the cost of a professional education and that it demands higher pay. It is not these poor men who grudge a just remuneration. The penny of a poor man is not less welcome in the sight of God

than was the offering of the two mites into the treasury.

The wealth of England has been in the last fifty years shifting. The day was when the riches were in the land, and its owners were the men of wealth and leisure, who did what was required of them, as witness the Parochial system. The wealth is now to be found with merchants and business people. Of course, in all cases and in all statements, an exception is to be found; but writing generally, though wealth was in the land at one time, there were poor landlords then, so now among the rich monied men there are more that are poor. All that I wish to say is, that the proportion of rich landlords has decreased and of rich merchants has increased.

In both ranks, there have been found noble-minded men, but more often narrow-minded ungenerous members of the Church of England.

The time was when all the power was on the land, but this power has shifted to the monied class, and of this class a labourer is one, his wealth is in his hand and he receives wages, money, and his influence as a voter is equal to the richest. The result of this is, that the land is unduly burdened, and of all the property derived from land, tithe is most unfairly, most dishonestly dealt with—as a proof—the income of a clergyman is treated as property; when it is only payment for services rendered, he (the clergyman) is only a professional man, and as a professional man his income should be treated. That land is unduly burdened with rates and taxes is well known, but for all that no effort is made to lessen them.

If the merchant and professional members of the Church of England would do their duty to their Church—as the Romanist, Wesleyan, Baptist, and other Dissenters try to do to their ministers, we should be able to meet the growing wealth and population of the kingdom, and no longer be pleading poverty; how often is this the case? There is a town in which some industry springs up and flourishes, and this attracts labourers and mechanics, houses must be built for them, and immediately a new town springs up, and in the majority of cases no provision is made for church or school. Man is a religious animal, his longings lead him to think of higher things, The old parish church is too far away, or has no room for him, the church has not been brought to his door, and so he seeks to remedy the wrong, with others building a meeting house for themselves, even, it may be, of two or more phases of thought—various places of worship spring up, and the unity of the Church is weakened. To meet this evil—though late in the day—an energetic clergyman comes and tries to regain the lost ground, and the country is inundated with circulars begging for a shilling to do the work which the enriched ground landlord should have done. Can we not imagine the question put to him at the last day to be "Thou wert enriched upon earth, and failed in the most precious duty to those who built up that wealth, can you expect now to be enriched by a mansion in Heaven."

The energetic clergyman plods on, and by degrees the church is built, but where is the endowment. The Bishop cannot accept that church and consecrate it until £45 a year is found. This is but enough to rent a small house and pay taxes. The services of the clergyman are but little recognised, and too often he finds himself on the verge of bankruptcy. That he worked hard is known—a cry goes up, What is the Bishop about, why does he not see that something is done? could he not give him a living? as if bishops had livings every minute at their disposal. When the rich groundlords fail in their duty, how can the bishop do it for them? It is the laity.

When incomes are small, and there is no means of saving for the rainy day, the laity should come to the rescue; and they will, if they once see the justice of the claim.

We are with the Clergy Pension Fund trying to do something for ourselves, and though in four years we have only accumulated £42,000, we might do more if every clergyman would appeal to his people to help the Pension Fund. With younger incumbents than myself, I can well understand a dislike to plead, as they may be thought to be doing for themselves personally, I think it but false modesty, because in these matters he is, (unless he be absolutely the poorest among us) pleading for others in the same or worse distress. If the Clergy Pension Fund should be enormously enlarged, I shall never be able, as it is at present constituted, to receive a penny—I am past the age for obtaining an annuity. I am pleading most disinterestedly for my brethren and the spiritual welfare of the people. Though still in the enjoyment of good health, I may suddenly be struck down—then I might hear remarks, "The time has come you ought to resign," and what would be my pension? a doubtful £50 a year to the impoverishment of my successor. In hundreds of cases the allowance would not be so much.

To meet the difficulties of to-day is impossible, but in the future the evils will be lessened through the intervention of the Clergy Pension Fund. The founders of this fund were Mr. R. Benyon and Mr. F. H. Rivington, who each gave £1,000. In 1889 the subscribers and donors only numbered 1,167, and of these 353 were the clergy themselves, and no layman gave more than £100. In the vast wealth of England it is very sad so few should be found to realise the true position of the clergy, and be ready of their own selves, to come forward without asking, to help those who week by week are ready to be their servants. It is a wonder that no one has followed the noble example of the founders, with one exception as yet known to me for the year 1890, Mrs. Turner of Liverpool having

given £10,000 in the Funds. Now, is it asking too much, viz., that the subscribers to the two great Missionary Societies, as representing the really religious mind of the country, be induced to give once more, as much as they gave to missions, to form a special fund of endowment for those who are unable to join the institution? Then, at least, £200,000 would be added to the fund, and its interest enable the annuitants to be cleared out of the way, and the pensions charged upon their successors to be abrogated, and the young incumbents be relieved of an unfair burden; and if the chairman of the Clergy Pension Institution could let it be known that the Church collections of the next twelvemonths (or till £200,000 be raised) would be devoted, so far as interest of money is concerned, to carrying out this plan, I imagine an impetus would be given, and aged incumbents would be encouraged to lend their aid.

When our Lord asked His disciples if they lacked anything while He was with them, they answered, Nothing. He then told them the case would be changed, and that they must seek for a due provision—no doubt implying, that as the priests of old were cared for by the offerings at the altar, so it must be now.

To the majority of laymen, I ask, what have you done for the service of your Church? What offerings have you given for the maintenance of your clergymen? Is your Church to be restored? you can come forward nobly for that. It has been a fashion of late years, and you do not like to be behind. Is a church to be built, for this help is to be found, but with regard to the officiating minister, it is still the old proverb—"Live horse, and thou shalt eat." There is a marriage in your family. What large sums are spent in decorations for the event—and compared with this item how small the complimentary fee; and yet more offensive are the sums spent at funerals, where people vie with each other in sending wreaths that have cost large sums to be heaped in the most lavish way on the coffin to perish before the day is gone. Far be it from me to speak against those wreaths the poor place upon the graves of the departed one, those flowers gathered with loving hands from the garden known and loved in life—and so it may be from the gardens of the rich; but I am against those wreaths of flowers bought from the florist, and never seen in many cases by the sender. Oh, cruel revenge upon the clergy—who have been protesting against the extravagance and cold pomp of ancient funerals, when hatbands, scarves, and gloves were a handsome perquisite, and were of use and benefit.* In rare cases he receives no more than the customary funeral fee. Then when headstones, etc., are to be raised, the incumbent is thought hard if he does not lower the printed and well-known fee, or remit it altogether—a less honest person, calmly inquires the fee, thanks for the information, and forgets to send it, knowing that it, as a fee, is irrecoverable. These are the only fees—if clergy were properly paid—that I should wish to see retained as necessary for control over the churchyards and fabrics.

The majority of professing Church people pay no tithes of their income. It perhaps cannot be expected that a tenth should be paid out of small incomes, yet it can be from those who are, as they themselves know, living in luxury and could with little effort reduce some of their expenditure. A stable is a luxury, the flower-garden also, the joining of clubs, etc.; but suppose a person estimated the cost of his household at £100 a-year per head, including by this, himself, wife, children at school, or on allowances, and servants, he would in very many cases find such a margin of income, from which he could if he chose give so liberally, that he would be able to assist well in all institutions now dependent upon charity. The late Bishop of Manchester's rule was—as to the division of his property—give a third, spend a third, and save a third.

The clergy are but of the same flesh and blood as the laity, and need their consideration; for if we have sown unto them spiritual things, is it a hard matter if we reap their worldly things?

One word in conclusion to the clergy. If you are a shareholder in a Fire Insurance Office Company it is to be expected that you should look after your own interests. But to all others I would say, can you not join your brethren in the Ecclesiastical Fire Insurance Office, as the profits of that Institution are to be given to the Clergy Pension Fund? Blood should be thicker than water. The Ecclesiastical Fire Insurance Office will give the commission to the agent, who acted for you in the office, the Foreign Office, if I may so call it, in which you have been in the habit of insuring, so that he would be no loser, and you and your brethren will be gainers, and the time may come when you yourself may reap a benefit. C. J. W.

* The writer is still enjoying the benefit of this custom, for though a curate in 1857, he became possessed of so much silk that he exchanged it for silk handkerchiefs now in use.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." August, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS number opens with a paper on a subject still under much discussion—namely, that raised by Mr. Gore's essay in *Lux Mundi*. Readers of the *Spectator*—and surely every clergyman whose interest in his studies rises above the level of "shop" reads the *Spectator*—will know how ably Canon Liddon, Dean Plumptre, and others have been carrying on that discussion; but we have read few letters or articles equal to Canon R. T. Smith's on the Old Testament and our Lord's authority, now before us. We quite agree with Canon Smith that the incorrectness—if it can be proved

—of theories destructive of the commonly accepted authorship of certain Old Testament books will not settle the question of our Lord's authority in quoting them ; it is too late, the question has been raised and cannot now be laid, it must therefore be faced. Canon Smith argues by analogy. If Christ "learned obedience," as the Epistle to the Hebrews says, He learned it and other moral virtues, stage by stage, according as they became suitable to His "Growth and Stature ;" so also did He learn those facts, the knowledge whereof is derived from observation and study. We feel (with Canon Smith) that since the Man Christ Jesus displayed in His intercourse with men no other knowledge of astronomy, geology, etc., than His contemporaries showed, therefore, as man, He possessed none.

Of all these things "He emptied Himself" did He not also of literary knowledge, if the expression may be allowed. "What reason" to quote Canon Smith, "is there for imagining Him endowed with knowledge which would have been useless for His blessed work, and which He gives no sign whatever of possessing? Would not reason suggest to us that, as it is the ordained condition of humanity that as surely as man is born in time and place, he must be content with the knowledge of his time and place, so our Lord, when He took humanity on Him in local and temporal conditions, took also the limits of natural knowledge which belonged to the condition He assumed?" This seems a reasonable argument, for the way in which it is followed out the paper itself must be read.

Canon Hicks acknowledges Professor Ramsey's criticisms in a paper which is a model of courtesy and modesty for disputants. *O si sic omnes!*

Dr. Plummer continues his recollections of Dr. Döllinger; they are an awful revelation of the ignorance and unscrupulousness of the Roman Church. Can this be true? "He (Dr. Döllinger) once saw in a village church a representation of the Trinity, and under it the words, 'Holy Trinity, pray for us.'"

We have not space to do more than mention Professor Milligan's paper on "The Resurrection of the Dead" and the continuation of Professor Bruce's articles on the "Epistle to the Hebrews."

THE "CHRISTIAN IRISHMAN."—Dublin : Mecredy & Kyle.

WE desire to call our readers attention to this excellent monthly penny magazine, published in Dublin. It is unsectarian, and ably conducted. The article on "Ireland and Rome," by the Rev. Thomas Connellan, formerly a Priest of the Church of Rome, is well worthy of careful perusal. Another article on "Father McGlynn and his Work in New York," gives a most remarkable account of this defiant Priest, who refuses to obey the Pope. The reception he got from Irish Roman Catholics is surprising. How will it all end? that is the question. Father McGlynn in New York, Father Connellan in Sligo, and Mr. John Dillon, M.P., all laugh at the fulminations of the Vatican, and, strange to say, they are backed up by a strong and compact body of sympathisers. Things cannot remain as they are, that, at least, is clear. The other articles and "Jottings" in this magazine are attractive and well chosen, and not confined to local matters. Altogether, we are much pleased with this publication, and think it deserves to be more widely known on this side of the Channel.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE GERMAN REEDS.

SIR,—Does it then follow that, if in several paragraphs, a writer uses several words, that they are used synonymously? There are many ways of recreating ; pleasure is one (?).

I said that pleasure was not mentioned, save only to be condemned by the teachers in Holy Writ. This tells its own story. It is obvious here that the word is used in its worldly sense.

I repeat that, "the *last* thing a religious teacher should think of is to provide amusement." Yes, and I play with children, too, my own and others. I may say further that I enter as heartily as anyone into their games. Cannot "W. A." distinguish things that differ?

No, far othewise, I do not condemn recreation. I am now myself taking it and am not ashamed. The writer said, or implied, that he had received spiritual comfort at a place of amusement. Prayer should precede our endeavours after such objects. My questions were, therefore, to the point. And here I am not ashamed to confess that I often chide myself for not doing everything in the spirit of prayer. That is the frame of mind that I like most to cherish.

I am glad to see that the results of "Your Contributor's" investigations are coincident with my anticipations — the Bible does not advocate our seeking the pleasures of the world. I can have nothing to say against, but much on the contrary for, all that leads us to "be merry and be glad" and to praise God in the symbols and dances." But we must keep apart those things which in their nature are so different. If a man can dance to "the glory of God," let him do it.

Your correspondents, if I may say so, have missed the point of my letter. I do not pretend to determine whether or not men should amuse themselves. What I do say is that the province of the religious teacher, as of the religious paper, is altogether of another sort. His aim is higher, his object nobler.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Hôtel Grande Bretagne, Bellagio,
August, 1890.

P.S.—"Hearing in Churches." May I be permitted five remarks on this subject—(1) Acoustic difficulties are not easily overcome: there are not sufficient data. (2) The two main elements in speaking are (α) production of tone ; (β) articulation. (3) The cause of echo is for the most part the former. (4) Less voice and more articulation ought, therefore, to be very helpful (5) The larger the building the slower the speaking must be a recognised principle of action.

MY CRITIC, MR. EDWARD LAWRENCE.

SIR,—I fear that your unprejudiced readers will wonder what this controversy is all about; and when, if ever, it is to end.

1. Perhaps a few questions to Mr. Lawrence may bring matters to a point. Does he believe that our Lord did not understand the Old Testament or its authority, or that He wilfully misled His hearers, and us?

2. Does he believe that the bread from heaven, in John vi., was our Lord's Body, which was born at Bethlehem? If that bread was His Divinity alone, it cannot be grossly eaten in the Eucharist.

3. I did not say that transubstantiation is impossible. How could I, with Cana and Galilee before me, and Aaron's rod? What I said was impossible is that words, which state a change *past*, "This is My Body," can make that very change. Any one can see this, if Jeremy Taylor and Burnett had not told us so a long time ago.

4. But I say that if our senses cannot determine whether the substance of bread remains, neither could the senses of the Apostles assure us that our Lord's Body was a body at all, much less that it was the same body restored.

5. I quoted a priest in proof of the theory that a body can be in many places at once. I said his thesis was nonsense, and that his premiss was more nonsensical still. He lays it down that, if any body moves, it must, at the outset, be in two places at once; and that, all through its course, it still remains in the same place. Is not this nonsense double-distilled?

6. He pooh-poohs the Ritualistic gloss upon the Bennett decision, because, forsooth, it is put forth by "a rather obscure Irish newspaper." But what, if our Irish clergy are, in great measure, led by that paper, is it not to be corrected? But, more, what if the same gloss is put on it in England? This week's *Church Times* says that Rome and we are quite agreed as to the nature of the presence. Is not this to be contradicted? The *Church Times* may speak for itself, but certainly not for the Church, at least, so long as Article and the Black Rubric stand.

7. Mr. Lawrence talks of "ignorance, vulgarity, profaneness, and irreverence," and calls upon you, sir, to put an end to it. He also thinks our controversy useless. I do not inquire which of all this is meant for me. If he answers my questions, I think the reasons will be very useful. If not, of course it will be useless; but then who will bear the blame?

8. Much of what Mr. Lawrence says shows that he does not understand my arguments. I have now made them as plain as I can; so, if he still mistakes them, he must abound in his own opinion, as I cannot give him any further help.

9. Allow me to correct two misprints in my letter. "What is to be adored?" In the middle of par. 1, I read, "Mr. Bennett pretending no longer to assert it in *error*, though he held it in his heart;" "error" should be "words." The other misprint is in the last words. "I believe *not*, because it is impossible, is the creed of others." The *not* should be erased. What I meant was, that some believe they know not what, whilst others believe simply because what they believe is impossible.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

(This discussion is now closed.—ED.)

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—Mr. E. Lawrence says that the gods of the heathen had no existence. I reply that they had as demons. Your readers must judge.

He denies that our Lord spoke of Jonah as a real personage. Again your readers must judge.

I say that if our Lord made His resurrection only parallel to a fable, it might be regarded as such itself.

Mr. E. Lawrence says that we have no proof that Jonah existed. I stand aghast.

He says that St. Paul only withstood St. Peter to the face. Well, that is all I did to "Presbyter."

Perhaps I was wrong in comparing the fable about Jonah to Cinderella. All I meant was that fables are much the same. I can see no difference between parables, fables, and allegories, and I need not go to Johnson.

Whether making Jonah a myth is old or new is nothing to the purpose. If our Lord refers, or seems to refer, to fables as if they were facts, His authorise is gone, whether He speaks in ignorance or from a wish to deceive. C. C., V.-G.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Manchester Courier* states that a peculiar difficulty has presented itself in connection with the recent appointment of Canon Maclure to the deanery of Manchester. The charter of Thomas de la Warre directs that no person shall be appointed Warden of the Cathedral of Manchester unless he has first taken either the degree of B.D. or of D.D. or is a D.C.L. It so happens that the Oxford term ended two days before Canon Maclure had been selected with the approval of the Queen for the vacancy created by the death of Dr. Oakley, and consequently the degree which he required to fulfil the condition of the charter could not be conferred upon him. The degree cannot possibly be granted at Oxford before about October 10th. In the meantime he will continue to discharge his old duties at Rochdale. The *Manchester Guardian* is informed that the Dean-designate of Manchester is to be formerly installed on October 28th. In the *Rochdale Parish Magazine* for August the Dean-designate, in a letter to the parishioners, states:—"By the favour of the Crown, I am called upon to sever my happy connection with this town and its people, and to become Dean of the Cathedral, the mother church of the diocese. For myself, as bred and born in Manchester, I hail with feelings of legitimate pride and satisfaction so distinguished an honour as that proposed for my acceptance. You cannot and will not be surprised at this outspoken sentiment, for I have loved for nearly fifty years of responsible and thinking existence every stone in the fabric over which, as Dean and Rector, I am called to preside, and have worshipped with parents and grandparents beneath its venerable roof. The pangs which I and each member of my family will feel in having to part with the church I have loved to serve and the home endeared by so many hallowed associations none but God and ourselves can know. Happily for us, the wrench will be softened by the lapse of a considerable interval, several months, during which time I shall hope to have frequent opportunities of speaking to you of the past, present, and future of this parish. And I am specially thankful to think with full confidence that in my successor you will find one in whom our Bishop has reposed such complete trust that I cannot entertain any apprehension as to his success amongst you, in the best sense of the word, and whom I may venture to bid you to 'receive in the Lord with all gladness.'"

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has submitted to the Queen the names of the Rev. George Rodney Eden and Canon Elwyn for the appointment of Suf-

fragan Bishop of Dover; and her Majesty has been pleased to appoint the former to succeed the late Bishop Parry. The Bishop of Dover occupies a confidential position in connection with the personal labours of the Archbishop. Mr. Eden was a distinguished classical and theological scholar at Cambridge. He was an intimate friend of the late Bishop of Durham, and for five years took a principal part in the oversight of the quasi-college of students which the Bishop formed in his own house at Auckland Castle. He is Rural Dean of Auckland, and has been for the last six years the vicar of the difficult parish of Bishop Auckland, with its 11,000 souls and four churches. He is known as a man of marked prudence, judgment, and conciliation, and his intimate connection with Bishop Lightfoot has given him an unusually wide and varied experience. Mr. Eden is married to a daughter of Canon Ellison, the founder of the Church of England Temperance Society and friend of Archbishop Tait, and belongs to a well-known family in the north, and is a nephew of Canon Hall, of Hunton, in Kent, and of Mr. T. D. Shafto Eden, of Cheveney, Maidstone. The Bishop-designate will be appointed by the Archbishop to the archdeaconry of Canterbury.

THE Bishop of Bedford held an ordination in the church of St. Augustine, Highbury, on St. James's Day. The Rev. H. Bindley, M.A., Vice-Principal of Codrington College, Barbadoes, was ordained priest, and Mr. James Nelso Carpenter, B.A., of the C.M.S. College, was admitted to deacon's orders.

THE Rev. David Marshall Lang, M.A., Corpus Christi, Cambridge; the Rev. Martin J. Hall, B.A., St. John's and Ridley Hall, Cambridge; the Rev. George H. V. Greaves, B.A., Corpus Christi and Ridley Hall, Cambridge; Miss S. J. Thompson, Miss M. Sander, Miss Wills, Miss H. K. Cornford, and Miss E. Reeve have offered and accepted for missionary work. The Misses Thompson and Sander will join the Rev. Barclay F. Buxton's party for Japan. Miss E. Reeve is a daughter of the late Canon Reeve, of Portman Chapel, and will go out at her own charges.—*Record.*

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adams, Rev. Frederick Archer, M.A., Vicar of Soulbury, Bucks.
Bacon, Rev. R. C., M.A., Rector of Gilston, Harlow.
Clapton, Rev. Edward Louis Churchill, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in St. Matthew's Chapel, Clapham-common (parish of Battersea).
Davenport, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of Wichenford, Worcester.
Druitt, Rev. C., M.A., Vicar of Harnham; Assistant-Inspector of Schools in Religious Knowledge for the Rural Deanery of Wilton.
Eden, Rev. George Rodney, M.A., Canon and Archdeacon of Canterbury.
Eyre, Rev. John Rashdale, M.A., Vicar of St. Helen's, Lancashire; Rector of St. Peter's, Tiverton.
Heberden, Rev. H. B., M.A., Rector of Oddington, near Stow-on-the-Wold.
Heywood, Canon H. R., M.A., Vicar of Swinton; Rural Dean of Eccles.
Hodge, Rev. Edward Grose, B.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Leicester.
Hunt, Rev. C. J., M.A., Vicar of Rainbow-hill, Worcester.
Jomini, Rev. F. J., M.A., Curate of Marylebone; Vicar of St. Thomas's, Arbour-square, E.
Lightfoot, Ven. Reginald Prideaux, M.A., Rector of Uppingham.
Morgan, Rev. T. L., Organising Secretary of the C.E.T.S. for the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Norman, Rev. J. G., East London Clergyman.
Owen, Rev. J. Arthur, B.A., L.Th., First Vicar of the New Parish of the Good Shepherd, Lee, S.E.
Palmes, Rev. Prebendary A.L., M.A., Vicar of St. Germans, Cornwall; Rector of Eythorne, Dover.
Pulley, Rev. Henry John, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Dulwich-common.
Ransom, Rev. R. J., B.A., General Licence to Officiate in the Diocese of Winchester.
Rawdon, Rev. J. Hamer, M.A., Vicar and Rural Dean of Preston; Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral.
Richardson, Rev. Charles Edward, B.A., Rector of Redmarshall, Durham.
Robinson, Rev. Charles H., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury; Vice-Chancellor of Truro Cathedral and Vice-Principal of the Theological College.
Russell, Rev. C., Curate of St. Paul's, Alnwick; Vicar of St. George's, Cullercoats, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Sharp, Rev. H. I., M.A., Rural Dean of Ely.
Shuttleworth, Rev. H. C., M.A., Rector of St. Nicholas, Cole Abbey; Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, London.
Snowden, Rev. Prebendary, M.A., Vicar of Hammersmith; Rural Dean of Fulham.
Snowdon, Rev. R. K., M.A., Vicar of Clifford; Vicar of Ledsham.
Spencer, Rev. J., Chaplain of St. Paul's Church, Nicosia; Local Commissary in the Island of Cyprus for Bishop Blyth.
Thompson, Rev. Arthur Steinkopff, B.D., Vicar of Balking-with-Woolstone, Berks.
Waller, Rev. Robert Plume, M.A., Vicar of Bitteswell, Leicestershire.
Weight, Rev. T. J., M.A., Vicar of Newnham-upon-Severn; Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Ashley-road, Bristol.
Wheeler, Rev. C., B.A., Vicar of Wolford, Warwickshire.
Wilford, Rev. R. C., M.A., Vicar of Birchencliffe; Clerical Secretary of the Wakefield Diocesan Education Society.
Woodward, Rev. W., Rector of Great Catworth, Huntingdonshire.
Wyld, Rev. E. G., Vicar of Mere; Vicar of Melksham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Buckell, Rev. William, Curate of St. Paul's, at 10, Powis-road, Brighton, suddenly, on the 2nd inst.
Hoyle, Jonas, for sixteen years Vicar of Christ Church, Gateshead, at Gateshead, suddenly, on the 28th ult.
Taylor, Rev. Vernon Pearce, M.A., Christ Church, Oxon, late Vicar of Pitcombe and Wyke Champflower, at South Willingham Rectory, Wragby (the residence of his son), on the 31st ult., aged 81 years.
Thorne, Rev. Joseph Prangley, Vicar of St. Bede's, Liverpool, at 101, Hartingdon-road, on the 18th ult.
Warburton, Rev. John, sometime Vicar of South Malling, Lewes, and formerly C.M.S. Missionary at Sierra Leone, West Africa, at Balham, on the 21st inst., aged 84 years.

The Church of England Pulpit.

OF FAITH AND LOVE IN CHRIST JESUS.

By the Rev. Canon DWYER, A.M.

Sermon Preached in Stopsley Church, Luton, Bedfordshire, July 20th, 1890.

"Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much; but unto whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. ..And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven....And He said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." —Luke vii. 47, 48 & 50.

THE incident, of which this text forms the moral, is at once unrivalled in its attraction and for its instruction. A rich dramatic fulness marks the progress of the action. The language is just as powerful and appropriate, as it is unforced and simple. A certain every-day reasonableness underlies the whole of the incident and its inferential lessons. And, these lessons concern all Christians in their fundamental relationships, as between a soul to be saved and a Saviour to be loved; also disclose, not in cold abstraction or in cloudy speculation but in living application and in practical activity, the place and the value of faith and of love in the economy of the Gospel.

We are introduced as in a picture to the scene. More than as in a picture we seem almost to listen. "One of the Pharisees had desired Jesus that He would eat with him, and He went into the Pharisee's house and sat down to meat," reclining on what we call an ottoman, in the usual Eastern fashion of that time, and having His feet extended on the side from the table backwards. The preliminaries as to such a condition, which had been so offensively omitted by the Pharisee, do not seem to have been noticed or resented by Jesus, so meek was He and lowly in heart. What the blind and cold-blooded idolatry of self in the Pharisee did not think of, at least, did not hospitably attend to, love, with keen vision, observed, and with unobtrusive but lavish devotedness abundantly supplied.

If we think naturally, as our Western ideas of social life would lead us, that the presence of "the woman in the city which was a sinner" was a startling intrusion, we must remember on the other hand, that this was social life in the East, where strangers seem to have been allowed in as witnesses. It concerns us to inquire into the actuating motives of what she did, rather than how she was allowed to be there at all. The vivid narrative places before our eyes her intention in the offerings she brought and the action she took. "When she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, she brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at His feet behind Him, weeping, and began to wash His feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed His feet and anointed Him with ointment." Here we must go back upon her spiritual history. We know from Mark (chap. i. 14) that Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled and the "kingdom of heaven is at hand repent ye and believe the Gospel." And of this we must also know how persuasively He enforced it on all occasions, when we read the 15th chapter of St. Luke with its three parables, dislosing the special work of each of the three persons of the Holy, Blessed and Glorious Trinity as taken therein: also we obtain that most wondrous insight into the magnitude of a work, because of which "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." And again have we not those words, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." How can we suppose that these words were not often uttered by Jesus, as the ceaseless welling up of "the waters of the river of life, clear as crystal," or as the music of heaven, sweeter far than silver bells, while He stood amidst dense crowds drawn by the magic of His love and grace.

No doubt on some such occasion, "the Lord and Spirit of life" opened her heart and "restored her soul." This accounts for her settled design, this explains her quick observation. All that the Pharisee had not but ought to have done, according to the laws of Eastern and Jewish hospitality, she now sees and does with a profusion of deep reverence, ingenuous tenderness, and trembling joy. When Abraham washed the feet of the unknown angel visitants, when Laban ordered water for Abraham's agent, and even "the men that were with him," when Joseph thought of water for his brethren ere they sat to meat; all this the Pharisee forgot or omitted—all this the woman perceived and supplied from the fountain of her flowing tears, and with the tresses of her dishevelled hair, herself for this unveiled. Animated, and encouraged by indulgent allowance, "she ceased not to kiss His feet" who brought to her the blessed tidings of deliverance from the dominion of sin, and the cancelling of its dread indictments. Alike unsparing of her resources as she was of her personal service, and yet not presuming "to dare a lifted eye" to the amiable Majesty of His love divine, she anoints not His head, but His feet with her costly ointment. Yes, this is a picture of a true penitent, kneeling, weeping, serving, giving, in love "at His feet behind Him," irresistibly attracted to "the merciful Receiver of all true penitent sinners."

Turn we now to the Pharisee which had bidden Jesus. A painter would doubtless delineate him now, sitting bolt upright, frigid with a Pharisee's rage,

his eyes upturned, with hands clutching his garments to rend them, with speech paralyzed in holy horror. Jesus seeing it all, knowing it all, both whence it issued, and how it worked, made this man condemn himself on his own accepted principles, and "judging rightly," too, on account of his heartless neglect in contrast with the penitent's devotedness of gift and seasonableness of service, and He draws the application in the words, "Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins which are many are forgiven, for she loved much; but to whom little is forgiven the same loveth little." We remarked already that there was an every-day reasonableness underlying this incident, and the lesson it taught. Men often insensibly argue in two ways to account for causes and effects. First from causes down to effects, if the cause exist, if it is adequate, if appointed, if applied. Secondly they argue back from effects to causes, and determine upon the action of the causes from the exhibition of the effects. The latter of these two methods is the argument of our Lord, that is first drawn out. Love is the proof of sin forgiven. "We love Him because He first loved us," with a forgiving love that cost Him so dear a price, and bestowed so vast a boon as pardon upon us.

But in case it might be thought that this love was the cause and not the consequence of the forgiveness—a preposterous error—our Lord then uses the second mode of argument, namely, that from causes to effects. He had used the first, graciously "turning to the woman" but addressing Simon; the second He urges, addressing herself, "And he said unto the woman, Thy sins are forgiven." Accordingly, to silence for ever all cavils wherever arising on His full power as the Son of man upon earth to forgive sins, then He said to the woman, not thy love, nor thy faith and love, nor yet "the whole circle of thy theological virtues," but, "thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." In other parts of Holy Writ, we find faith spoken of severely and grandly, as standing by itself, the sole medium for receiving God's pardon, and recovering life, as when Paul gives the terrified, conscience-stricken jailer at Philippi, the authoritative answer, "Believe in the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved." We read again in St. John's Gospel, what faith does (iii. 16); again (v. 24), "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." This is further laid down in an irrefragable chain of formal argument by St. Paul in the former part of his Epistle to the Romans. Then on the other hand, St. James's Epistle exhibits the argument from effects back to causes, and he concludes with the clinching question, "Can faith, (viz., this kind of it, that is but a mere sham) save him." Indeed it is very remarkable, that Abraham is adduced as an example in himself of these two methods. St. Paul in Romans (chap. iv.) cites his case as one of gratuitous forgiveness by faith, while St. James (chap. iii.) cites him as confirmatory of the further fact that this faith is not fruitless but attested by its inevitable effects, as Jehovah says, "Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that," etc. And so St. John asserts, "Now we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren"; while the Lord puts our forgiveness of injuries as the test and evidence of divine forgiveness, and makes this the very keystone of His prayer. Again, as we may expect, these two graces are often simply conjoined, as when Paul writes of "faith and love which are in Christ Jesus," just as men commonly talk of life and action, of summer and of balmy warmth in its bright glad sunshine.

There are two main lessons to be learned from all this. First, there have been, and still are found, those who talk of faith and omit to specify repentance or absorb it in faith, whereas they are two distinct processes, directed to two distinct objects. "Repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." Also, by way of magnifying the blessed effects due to faith and to faith alone, such persons further dwell exclusively upon the infinite blessing received, when Jesus, as here, says, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." Well, this faith is indeed the prime agent, the only hand that takes hold of Christ the Saviour for salvation from guilt. But how conclude that this hold is taken, that this hand does grasp Him, that His shed blood is sprinkled, that His word is spoken, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." How in a word infallibly conclude, how even venture a hope that the soul is alive from the dead, that the wild olive is transplanted and engrafted into the body of Christ, when there is no life seen, no fruit found. If, on the one hand, "good works are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification" as being its consequence, they cannot of course be its cause. So, on the other hand, equally is the expectation of a pardon being actually received, a mere delusion, if the man is still found hard and helpless as a marble statue, and cold as a block of ice. That man, whatever he may think of himself and of his absolution by Jesus Christ, is still dead—dead in sins and trespasses. Jesus has not said this to him, nor any one yet effectually in His name.

The second lesson is this, that while love is the greatest thing in the world, greater than the "faith" of miracles, of which St. Paul was specially writing in 1 Cor. xiii. greater even than faith in Christ as Saviour, still for all that, it is such at all only as it comes "of faith." For, as a vast lake, fed from three distinct tributary head-waters, "the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, out of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned" (1 Tim. i. 5).

It may be a pretty fancy to read in Greek mythology of the aching head of Jupiter, of Vulcan's

axe applied to it, and of Minerva stepping forth full grown, and in her shining panoply of proof. It may be very pleasant to find some lovely fresh-cut flowers still fair and fragrant in an ornamental vase. But charity is not "as the greatest thing on earth," like either of these. As "faith without works is dead being alone," so love without faith, being alone, is dead. We cannot thus separate divine sequences or isolate them after this fashion, whether consequences from causes, or causes from consequences. This method makes out charity something self-caused, self-kindled, self-consuming. And no residuum will be left visible, unless cold ashes. And cold ashes are not "the greatest thing in the world."

An application of the evolution theory to physical causation does not, fortunately, interrupt or mar the progress of natural energies. An application of a parallel theory to spiritual causations has this evil tendency in an alarming degree. While the inferior forms are ever progressing in an ascending scale up to the superior, these intermediate steps are here ignored absolutely, as for instance of "faith working by love." And further, in the very statement recently made public about "charity as the greatest thing in the world," this is presented as a supremely subjective evolution, beginning and ending in self. The eloquent statement we allude to, when read in the light of the passage before us, looks very near akin to an idealistical and atheistical idolatry of SELF. Anyhow it leads straight to this goal.

The sturdy practical sense of English Christians is not likely to be taken in by this dreamy speculation. The keen analytic faculty of the hardheaded Scotch brethren will dissect it neatly, and find nothing in it. The perfervid energy of the Irish will recoil from its cloudy chilliness. Yet many may embrace it, who affect rare novelties, and amuse themselves with religious fads. For is not this a critical time, in which a cyclone of errors blows in every direction, and all Christians are being tried, whether or not they have and use "the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left." There is and ever has been "a philosophy falsely so called." But "philosophy divine" knows from revelation and from its application that love succumbs unless as "faith saves." And that love is only a true, a living and a lasting reality where penitence and faith, together with love, have "stood at the feet of Jesus behind Him," (ready in spirit, were it an actual possibility ever to) "wash His feet with tears, wipe them with the hairs of the head, kiss and anoint the blessed feet of Him"—"who liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore." Our Alpha and Omega, the Lord the Lamb, at once "the Author and Finisher of our faith." And the man who had more of this "best of gifts," this "greatest of things on earth," this charity divine, than perhaps any other living man except the Lord Himself, said, "The life that I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." Thus Paul found and fed his charity; thus may we as well. It is the only way this can be done with the sanction of God and in the hope of heaven.

LOVE OF GOD.

BY THE REV. L. R. RAWNSLEY, M.A.

SERMON PREACHED IN HORNSEY PARISH CHURCH.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment."—MARK xii. 30.

HAD no voice ever declared authoritatively what was the first commandment, thinking religious men who were persuaded that God was no respecter of persons, would have felt convinced that it must be something which rich and poor, healthy and sick, European and Indian, could equally observe. God would manifestly have been unjust had He enacted as the first and great commandment an ordinance which the cripple, by his weakness, and the labourer, by his poverty, had been unable to fulfil. The teaching of Jesus Christ confirms our expectation. He tells the inquiring scribe, who appears to have been a man of deep-rooted religious conviction, that the first commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." These words were first spoken by Moses to those who saw in their deliverance from Egyptian bondage and their preservation in the wilderness abundant proof of God's lovingkindness, and who were disposed to love God for benefits which they rightly deemed Divine favour. The scribe to whom Christ repeated the words was evidently prepared to acknowledge that love from man was God's due. We to-day, who read the words of Moses, and know Christ's approval of them, we who thank God for all His goodness and lovingkindness to us and to all men, and especially bless Him for His inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, must accept the commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." Everybody who has a desire to serve God can love Him. Wherever men and women are there is love found. The king in his palace, the noble in his hall, the merchant in his villa, the artisan in his cottage, love their homes, cherish their wives and children, rejoice in their dear ones' happiness, grieve when their beloved suffer, and weep when their yearning eyes see the vacant chair, and they know that they have lost one of their heart's treasures. We believe that love is of God; we believe that man honours God when he offers Him that which

is best in his nature, and that God does not want us to please Him by hurting ourselves, that He does not ask us to sacrifice the first-born child, nor to cast away our dearest possession, but that He does seek our love, and is pleased with a faith that works through love.

During the past week, in visiting my sick, aged, and bedridden parishioners, I have dwelt much on this first commandment. I have thought that it would be a comfort to them to feel that in spite of sickness, age, and infirmity, they were still able to do that which was of the chief value in God's sight—they were still able to love. Love does not cease when sickness enters a home; love grows stronger, not weaker, as our years increase. The sick man thinks of his wife and children, and often his chief anxiety is, "How will they fare while I am laid up and incapacitated for work?" The sick woman listens when her boys and girls come home from school, and smiles on them as they enter her room and eagerly ask if she is better. The aged man and woman, whose years are nearly numbered, are rendered so very happy because a married daughter has paid them a visit and brought her children also to see grandfather and grandmother. It is something to be able to say to these who are inclined to think that their time and power for serving God are over, "Not so; you can still keep the first commandment, you can love the Lord your God."

Let us pass on to consider the characteristics of this love. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God *with all thy heart.*" There is a compassion which we all feel for one whose life has no love, or very little love in it. We pity the orphan, who, brought up amidst strangers, never knows a mother's tenderness, nor the fostering care of a father. We further compassionate the man who has had to rough life alone, without a loving partner to alleviate his sorrows, and to share his joys. We experience a feeling akin to sadness as we hear of one dying alone, unsupported by love of wife and child. We recognise that love is necessary to complete man's life. We experience a need of love, a need of clinging to others, and knowing that they cling to us. We congratulate man and woman when "they love their best, closest, and sweetest"; we are glad that what we believe the needs of their human nature will be satisfied. Should we not extend our thoughts? Should we not feel that the highest need in human nature is the love of God? Should not we long for this love to crown all earthly love, and to consummate our life? Should we not, each of us, love the Lord our God with all our heart, clinging to Him as the source and giver of all joy; knowing that there could come no greater void in our lives than to miss the presence of our Heavenly Friend? A man may not be blessed with earthly love, and may not sigh for his loss, even though others feel that life for him is clouded and confined; similarly there are those who are not conscious of loving God, and who do not grieve because they are without this blessing; but still I hold that their lives are maimed, and their joy paltry compared with those joys that God gives to those who love Him. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God *with all thy soul.* There is a love which we call profane, and there is a love which we deem holy. Profane love enthrals its votary; holy love ennobles its aspirant. Profane love is of the earth earthy, and clips the wings which might have soared heavenwards. Those who enjoy it lose themselves in the pleasure of the moment, and forget that time is fleeting, and that there are duties in the world which are being left unheeded and unfulfilled. Such a love may be classed amongst the things which belong to the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, and which are not of the Father, but of the world. Such a love will pass away with the world and the lust thereof, whereas he that doeth the will of God, and loves the Lord His God with all his soul will abide for ever. To love the Lord our God with all our soul is to be doing His will, and this love is holy love. With the Greeks the soul was the seat of all the moral qualities—of bravery, of justice, of honour, of holiness. We are to love God with all that is best in our nature. In the sunshine of His love Divine graces planted in those who are made in God's image will spring up, and life will be purer, fairer, and brighter, because God has been loved with all the soul. I may, perhaps, illustrate my meaning by reverently suggesting that there must be chivalry in our love for God. The old knights and cavaliers proved the worth of their love by winning repute for courtesy and gentleness, as well as for daring exploits. King Arthur made his knights of the Round Table swear

> To love one maiden only, cleave to her,
> And worship her by years of noble deeds
> Until they won her.

And thus He justified the vow:

> I know
> Of no more subtle master *under heaven*
> Than is the maiden passion for a maid,
> Not only to keep down the base in man,
> But teach high thought, and amiable words,
> And courtliness, and the desire of fame,
> And love of truth, and all that makes a man.

Notice those words, *under heaven.* I am inclined to believe that the poet meant by them that he knew of no better influence in this world which lies under heaven's canopy. It is possible, however, to interpret the words, "Heaven is the most subtle master; after heaven there is no more subtle master." Whether the words bear this interpretation or not, we may surely say that heaven, and a love of heaven, which is a love of God, will induce love for "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are of good report," because these are the graces which

are godlike, and which befit those who are called the sons of God.

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God *with all thy mind.* When the scribe gave his consent to Christ's decision, he substituted for the words "with all thy mind," "with all the understanding," thus showing how he interpreted Christ's words. These words show that God not only wishes man to lean on Him as the Father who satisfies all His children's needs, and to serve Him with lofty devotion, because "holiness becometh His house for ever;" but also claims that man should meditate on the nature of Him who inhabiteth eternity, and see that He is worthy to receive our love, because there is nothing which could reasonably give us cause to withhold our love. The mind must not welcome any doubt of God's goodness, must not forget that He is the Author of all good things, the Source of Love, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This commandment really signifies that our love for God should come from the whole man, and should be the joint offering of body, soul, and spirit, all united to give God the richest gift of love.

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God *with all thy strength.* These words bear a twofold interpretation. They signify that God is to be loved with all the strength of the heart, with all the strength of the soul, and with all the strength of the mind. They exhort us that we should seek to show our love for God by using every means in our power to glorify His holy name. We shall wish to follow Him—and where is He represented to us better than in the person of His Son Jesus Christ?—as Christ's disciples followed Him, and to sit at His feet, as Mary sat at the feet of Jesus. We shall pray that ours may be the daring love which is always loyal to the absent Lord. It will be our highest privilege to be allowed to use our natural gifts and intellectual and spiritual powers for God's glory. In this way "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength." In another way also "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength." Your love must be enduring love, kept alive by the will, and by your courage and your faith in the hour of adversity, sickness, or distress. Then you will draw nigh to your God, and rejoice in His sympathy, and feel safe with Him, even as the child nestles closer to her mother during the thunderstorm, and is composed when mother is in room. Then you will learn—

> There is a comfort in the strength of love
> 'Twill make a thing endurable, which else
> Would break the heart.

And the intrinsic value of your love will be proved by the test to which it has been put by affliction.

Finally, brethren, observe that there is nothing demanded in this great commandment above the strength of any man. God simply asks the best from each man according to his ability. The weak must not be discouraged because he cannot attain to the standard of the strong, neither must the strong be content to do as much as the weak. Christ has told us that our main duties are to love God, and to love our neighbour. Christ gave proof that He loved the Father with all the heart when He passed whole nights in silent communion with Him. That He loved His Father with all the soul we all acknowledge, and wish in our better moments that our love for God had produced the sinlessness which Christ maintained. Christ loved the Father with all the mind when He could say at Lazarus's grave, "I knew that Thou hearest me always." He loved the Father with all the strength when He told the disciples that the prince of this world would be marshalling his powers against Him, but that He was willing to bear, the just for the unjust, all the consequences of sin, and death its last penalty, that the world might see in Him an example of love obedient, and love triumphant. It was Christ's desire that His example, and His revelations of the Father should inspire the same love in His disciples. At the conclusion of His prayer for them He said, "I have declared unto them Thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them." May Christ's example, and Christ's teaching stimulate our endeavours, and make us all anxious to serve God with what He will appreciate more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices—the love of all the heart, all the soul, all the understanding, all the strength, while we also strive each to love his neighbour as himself.

> If with honest-hearted love for God and man,
> Day by day Thou find us doing what we can,
> Thou who giv'st the seed-time wilt give large increase,
> Crown the head with blessings, fill the heart with peace.

THE union of the benefices of St. George's, Botolph Lane, and St. Magnus-the-Martyr, London Bridge, is proposed. The street improvements in the neighbourhood of the Monument have cleared away many of the parishioners.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 16, 1890.

CHURCH SCHOOLS.

ERE the day of free education fully dawns, it may be well for prominent Churchmen to once more take into serious consideration the actual position of Church Schools, with a view to facing the obvious effects of the movement which promises to engulf the remaining Church Schools. Parishes where elementary education is carried on under Church auspices may be divided into two main classes, those in which the "schools" form the almost central feature of the parochial organization where the clergy take the trouble to become acquainted with the intricacies of our complicated educational code, where laity and clergy are working hand in hand to vie successfully with the strong opposition to which they are subjected by the Board Schools, and where, as a natural consequence, Church, parish and schools are eminently and obviously prosperous. On the other hand there are many districts in which the incumbent, feeling little or no interest in the secular elementary education of the youth of his parish, finds the work of carrying on the schools entrusted to his care only "a weariness of the flesh." He has no capacity for the work, and he finds it a burden, and this feeling soon becomes disseminated amongst his laity, until the question of Church Schools, instead of being the question of how to supersede those erected by the board often deteriorates, under the circumstances ennumerated into the serious consideration as to whether the schools will have to be given up. In the face of all this we cannot help looking with hopeful interest on the decided progress which has been and is being made by the modern school of clerical thought in favour of Church Schools. Would that there had been more of this class of men 20 years ago! We believe that at any rate among the earnest few, that, come what may, the Church will, in some cases at least, manage to maintain her present action, for surely there could be no sadder or more disastrous event to the progress of Christianity in our own country than the entire secularizing of our schools. Again, schoolmasters and mistresses will often confess that there is a marked difference between children educated in Church and Board Schools. This difference they say is a moral one, and that there is a distinctly better tone among Church School children. This of course may be due to various causes—first of all to the fact that the higher fees secure a better class; and secondly, that it is easy to exclude from the school any boys or girls whose influence upon their schoolfellows might be deleterious; but these facts alone do *not* account for the difference. We have over and over again heard experienced school teachers say that the often almost silent influence of the Church with which the schools are connected has its direct force, and the facility with which the children are brought into contact with the various religious activities, has a distinctly softening, humanizing, and consequently beneficial effect upon the school in general.

When Church Schools cease, this influence for good ceases too. The British workman would gladly vote for free education, because it means no school pence for him to pay, and because it would practically be paid by his richer brethren. It is not for us at this juncture to ask whether this is a right principle, but to face the matter out as it stands, and unless something very unforeseen takes place, we shall not have long to wait for the fruition of the free education scheme. What then is to be done? Surely Churchmen are not going to be silent when there is a possible means of escape. In all Board Schools the result of any such act would mean increased grant and increased rates, and this we maintain must be applied to National Schools, increased grant from Government and increased subscriptions, &c., from loyal Churchmen.

The question of the responsibility which the Church has of educating her children on religious principles must be brought more home to the laity, and the question of the home education of the young made to take a prior place even to that of foreign missions. The influence of the Church is strong still, and we believe if there be but sufficient vitality and activity shown in reference to this matter by Church clergy, government will never be able to do anything that will materially affect the survival of our old Church Schools.

THE CONTINENT AND PEACE.

THE official organ of the Papal Court at Rome, the *Observer* (*Osservatore Romano*), has lately taken occasion to indulge in sneering re-

marks on the noble Italian band of men who are now striving to interest their countrymen in the cause of International Arbitration and Peace. Hereupon, Signor Moneta, the able editor of the influential journal, the *Secolo*, of Milan, has replied in the following significant words :—"If the Roman Catholic clergy continue to hold aloof from this great question of Peace and War, which, for all men of benevolence, ought to have a chief attraction, and if the journals of the Vatican persist in railing at the Peace Societies, as the *Osservatore Romano* has done, public opinion will be further taught where to look for the real advocates of human interests. And if the efforts of the Peace party should be successfully thwarted, mankind will know where to affix the responsibility for the bloody massacres which, possibly, may yet afflict the most prosperous countries of Europe."

There has lately appeared at intervals a series of letters, in another Italian journal, the *Roma*, by Professor Fiore, of the Naples University, advocating a new political arrangement of Europe, with a view to general disarmament. He examines the question of disarming from all sides, and comes to the conclusion that it is impossible that the nations can much longer tolerate the destination of a great part of production to the keeping up of large armies.

The Chevalier F. de Yrigoyti, of France, writes to the Peace Society, that, in his opinion, there is being manifest a distinct growth of public opinion in that country in favour of International Peace and Arbitration.

A veteran foreign member of the London Peace Society is Mr. Conrad Stollmeyer. He was born in Ulm in 1813. His father was a wine merchant and the proprietor of the hotel, the "White Horse." Conrad was his only son. Ulm was one of the free cities of Germany, until it was besieged and taken by Napoleon I., and then handed over first to Bavaria and later to Wurtemberg. The history of the siege and subsequent occupation of Ulm by the French, often related by the mother to the children, made a lasting impression upon Conrad, who resolved, as a child, never to become a soldier, or join in any war. Five hundred French soldiers, with a general and other officers, were quartered in the house of his parents. They had to be provided with everything ; and what they could not consume, or carry away, they destroyed. Before leaving, they opened the feather-beds, upon which they slept, and let the feathers fly out of the windows ; they stove the casks in and let the wine run in the cellars ; and once, when filled with wine, they threatened to kill his father, unless he would give them the better quality which was reserved for the general. His mother ran to the room of the general, and begged on her knees for protection, when the general ordered twelve men with loaded muskets to remain in the saloon, and shoot any man who would attack his father. This happened several years before Conrad was born, but the mother often related it to her little boy.

RELIGIOUS REVIVALS IN THE XIII. AND XIV. CENTURIES.

By the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., Vicar of St. Luke, Chadderton, Oldham.

A Paper read before the Oldham Clergy Society.

IT is said that Dean Maitland was once asked, *à propos* of his own book, Why were the Middle Ages called dark? "They are only so called," he replied, "by those to whom all ages are dark."

But if an abundance of great names can redeem any age from such an opprobrious epithet, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are abundantly redeemed. The age of Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lulli, Duns Scotus, Grostête, Matthew Paris, William Occam, St. Francis, St. Dominic, Wiclif, Froissart, Dante, Petrarch, to say nothing of a crowd of other scholarly names—the age of St. Louis and our own Edward I.—the age when the Mariner's Compass was invented, or at any rate improved, the age that laid the English Parliament on a firm foundation, is dark, if dark at all, only with excess of light. In truth it was not a dark age ; it was (to quote a modern author) "an age of chivalry no less in religion than in love ; an age sweetened by a new, strong, impulse of human pity. The Church feels within itself a new enthusiasm for humanity ; men begin to visit the prisons, to redeem the captives, to love the sick, the poor, the sinful ; even to long for sickness and poverty, as if they were in themselves virtues. To rescue the captive, to feed the hungry, to nurse the leper,—this is the new ideal of mankind. For the great names of the preceding century are either monks, or warriors with dogmatic or militant minds, like Bernard of Clairvaux or Thomas Becket ; but this is the era of charity and speculative thought."

In 1291 the Crusaders were finally driven out of Syria, the last crusade was over. During a period of almost exactly 200 years, the crusades had absorbed all that was holiest and purest, most ardent and noblest in European manhood. All men went ; either to leave their bones to whiten on the fields of Palestine, or else to return, strangely altered after many years ; but whilst they were away, those left at home suffered sadly. Whole districts of corn-land and pasture, lapsed into moss and marsh. Whole country-sides were thinned of hale and active men.

And then so few, so very few, did return, and the remnant returned enfeebled and worn out. And what were their widows and those dependent on them to do? Some sought rest and quiet in the cloister ; but for those who had no vocation for that life, the world was undoubtedly hard. The appeal of hungry petitioners crying : "Bread for God's sake, for the love of Christ, bread !" was heard for many years in many a market-place, and was not heard in vain.

Amongst those who heard it was a certain kindly priest, who lived at Liège, named Lambert le Begue. He pleaded for them, and so much did his eloquence move the hearts of his hearers, that gold and silver poured in upon him, and he built a little square of cottages, a hospital, and a church. Here at first he

housed his widows, who spent their time in prayer and meditation, in spinning and sewing, in nursing and visiting. Soon others followed his example, and the order of Beguines grew with surprising rapidity. Before 1250 there were Sisterhoods in most of the chief cities of Flanders, France, Switzerland, Germany, and elsewhere. Their success suggested the idea of a Guild of uncloistered workers of both sexes, and, in the Netherlands especially, there grew up a fraternal spirit—a popular impulse. Weavers, armourers, tailors, cobblers, mechanics of all classes, joined themselves to the fraternity. They were bound by no vows, and fettered by no rule; they still carried on their trade, like a more famous tent-maker did many hundred years before them; only in their leisure they met together for prayer—for telling the strange dreams they saw, and for talking over their mystical ideas; moreover at many a sick bed you might meet a woman clad in a simple smock, and a great mantle like a veil. No doubt many of them were ignorant, and certainly in after years many turned to heresy, especially Pantheism. But long before Beguinage took that turn, its leading idea had worked itself into the soul of one more competent to work it out than Lambert of Liège.

In 1182, he whom we now call St. Francis of Assisi, was born. His early history—how he was intended for trade, how he fell ill about the age of twenty-four, and was almost at death's door; how his hard-headed practical parent turned him out of doors, lest his too liberal gifts to church restoration funds should land the business in bankruptcy; how he read the New Testament in the vernacular, done by the Waldensians; how he saw visions, and in dreams heard perpetually the words: "Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses, neither scrip for your journey, neither two coats, nor yet staves;" until at last he literally obeyed them, is known to everyone. Four years after that eventful illness he had matured his schemes, he went to Rome and obtained the Papal sanction for the rule he intended to found; probably, at first, the strangest the world has ever seen. All property must be absolutely surrendered; every member must literally be a beggar; money might not even be touched. And, still stranger, learning (at least its outward means) was esteemed equally needless. All books were forbidden. "Get your Breviary into your heart of hearts," said St. Francis to a scholar who fain would join the brotherhood, "and provide yourself with a treasure in the heavens; who ever heard of Christ reading books, save when He opened the book in the synagogue, and then closed it and went forth to teach the world for ever!" Truly has it been said that the early doings of the Franciscans remind us of the extravagancies of the Salvation Army; but none the less, the new Order grew. It was a mission to the poor by those who for their sakes became poor also, and it worked wonders. But not only amongst the poor, amongst the masses of crowded cities, amongst the sick, the deformed, the leprous, had the new brotherhood success; its leader's sublime self-surrender seemed to communicate itself to all his converts. The Minorites (as the Franciscans were called) were to be found everywhere. In 1215, when the new Order held its first chapter, the number of the brotherhood, and the area over which it worked was so great, that it was found necessary to nominate Provincial Ministers in France, Germany, and Spain.

And not only so. Vows of poverty seemed to be in the air. While these things were going on in Italy, in Spain St. Dominic was vexing his soul at the continual spread of heresy. His plan was an order—an order of preachers; and for it he also obtained Papal sanction, but poverty was at first no part of his rule. Soon, however, he perceived that the greatest cause of the spread of heresy and of the deterioration of Church life, was the worldliness and wealth of monks and ecclesiastics, and the conviction spread that sanctity was attainable only by those who are ready to part with all their worldly possessions, and give to such as needed.

The Franciscans had made it abundantly plain that a vast army of fervent missionaries could live from day to day and work wonders in evangelising the masses without owning a rood of land, or having anything to depend upon but the bounty which flowed from the gratitude of their converts; if therefore the Dominicans—the preaching Friars—were to succeed at such a time as this, it was clear that they also could only hope to do so by exhibiting the same sublime faith.

Accordingly, in 1219, the year after the second chapter of the Franciscans was held at Assisi, a general chapter of the Dominicans was held at Bologna, and there the profession of poverty was formally adopted, and the renunciation of all means of support except such as might be offered from day to day was insisted on. Henceforth the two orders laboured side by side in magnificent rivalry; mendicants who went forth like Gideon's hosts with empty pitchers to fight the battles of the Lord, and whose desires, as far as the good things of this world went, were summed up in the simple petition: "Give us this day our daily bread." The tide of popular enthusiasm which welcomed their appearance swept before it alike the hesitation of Rome, the jealousy of the older orders, and the opposition of the parochial priesthood. Thousands of brethren gathered in a few years around Francis and Dominic, and begging friars and wandering preachers, clad in their coarse frock of serge, with the girdle of rope round their waist, wandered as missionaries everywhere, battled with heresy, lectured in Universities, and preached and toiled amongst the poor. In towns especially they were welcomed. The rapid progress of population within the boroughs had outstripped the sanitary regulations of the Middle Ages, and fever and plague and leprosy raged in the wretched hovels of the suburbs. It was to haunts such as these that St. Francis especially directed his followers; in London they settled in the shambles of Newgate; at Oxford they made their way to the swampy ground between the walls and the streams of the Thames.

Nor would they erect sumptuous dwellings for their own habitation; Albert of Pisa even ordered a stone cloister, which the burgesses of Southampton had built for them, to be levelled to the ground. Their own habits were the strictest asceticism. "You need no little mountains to lift your heads to heaven," was his reply to a claim for pillows. None but the sick went shod. To work amongst the poorest of the poor, the Minorites took up their abode amidst the haunts of the poor, and amongst them lived on charity; doing for the lowest the most menial offices; speaking to the poorest the words of hope, preaching to learned and simple such sermons—short, homely, fervent, and emotional—as the world had not heard for many a day.

How could such evangelists fail to win the day? Before Henry the III.'s reign was half over, the

predominance of the Franciscans over Oxford was almost supreme. At Cambridge their influence was less dominant only because no commanding genius like Robert Grostête was there to favour and support them. And soon the one blot on the Franciscan rule—its contempt of learning—was removed. Before Edward I. came to the throne, Kilwardy, a Franciscan Friar, had been chosen Archbishop of Canterbury. Bonaventura had been offered the Archbishopric of York. And meanwhile elsewhere, giants such as Alexander Hales, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, Occam, Thomas Aquinas, and Albertus Magnus were by their lectures and their books giving to intellectual life that amazing lift into the higher regions of thought, speculation, and inquiry, which prepared the way for greater things by-and-bye.

But just as "before ever the pot can be made hot with thorns, the wind blows away both the green wood and the dry," so before the religious character can be fully formed, too often the blaze of a revival is out. Of the Franciscan revival Tennyson's oft-quoted lines are terribly true: "The old order changes, giving place to new, lest one good custom should corrupt the world." Taking 1221 as the year when the Friars landed in England, we cannot pass over a century before we find degeneracy, like a flood-tide, setting in. We must remember, however, how unpropitious were the conditions of the century. In 1349 the Black Death broke out, and raged for at least two years with an appalling severity, demoralizing terribly the Church. The great schism had not yet, it is true, shaken to its very foundations the magnificent mediæval idea,—one God, one Empire, one Church; but the state of things was bad enough. Ecclesiastical pride, abuses in preferments, and non-residence, still more Papal exactions were already producing that fierce hatred and contempt of Rome, which never slept till the Reformation.

Yet when the great Master of Baliol took up his pen against the abuses of the period, it was not the Papal Court principally, but the Friars at whom he struck. The higher orders he branded as hypocrites, who, professing mendicancy, had stately houses, rode noble horses, and had all the pride and luxury of wealth with the pretence of poverty. The humbler he denounced as common able-bodied beggars, who ought not to be permitted to infest the land. So far Wyclif had both Universities and Crown on his side; he was appointed (amongst many other marks of royal favour) a Commissioner to go to Rome, and treat with the Pope about certain disputes that had arisen.

But that closer view of the Papacy showed Wyclif that there were other evils besides degenerate Friars. At any rate, the close of Edward III.'s reign finds persons ecclesiastical taking a different view of Wyclif, and Wyclif taking a different view of matters ecclesiastical. He became more and more the antagonist of the hierarchy, especially of the wealthy dignitaries. The lower clergy were not, however, alarmed; neither did Oxford scholars as yet repudiate him. From amongst these, Wyclif organized an order of preachers, who travelled through the land, preaching sometimes in churches, sometimes in the highways and market-places. Soon they supplanted the old mendicant orders, and, however we account for it,—whether with Neander, we lay it to their knowledge of the Scriptures, or with Professor Thorold Rogers, we say it was that they put themselves at the head of political agitation (Neander admits that Wyclif was too much of a politician), or, with Dean Milman, say "these men spoke with that simplicity and earnestness," which appeals to that "latent religiousness" which lies deep down in the heart of the common people,—the fact is certain that Lollardism grew and spread. In the exaggeration of panic-stricken opponents, it was said, If you met three men together, two were Lollards.

Literature came to the preachers' aid; William Longland, "in his Complaint of Piers Ploughman," paints with terrible plainness, and in a tone of deep sadness, all the evils under which the land laboured. The consciences of men were with the new order; like the early Methodists four centuries after, the Lollard preachers were eagerly listened to; and in the castle, in the hut, amongst all orders, ranks and classes, their influence quickly made itself felt. London was a hot-bed of the new opinions, just as afterwards it was of Puritanism. No doubt there was both heresy and political disaffection mingled with the movement, but neither of these stayed its course either in England or on the Continent. Richard II.'s queen—the first good Queen Anne—was a Wycliffite; and through her, probably, his tenets passed to Bohemia, to John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. In fact, Lollardism triumphed in reality, even if not in name, and its triumph was uninterrupted until a new century with new men, and the new learning gave a new channel to men's thoughts and actions.

But that period is beyond the scope of a paper far too long already; it remains only to see if we can gather some lessons for the nineteenth century from these few facts about revivals in earlier centuries.

What do these revivals teach us?

First, are they not an encouragement, much needed, I admit, to workers in this worldly, luxurious, effeminate age. These bygone centuries, although very far from dark in that sense in which merely popular Protestantism uses the term, were full of violence, oppression, and cruelty; the Church was rich and too much occupied with things temporal; the world was self-willed and sensual. But the old Jewish proverb, "When the tale of bricks is doubled, then comes Moses," proved true then; it will again. Some would say that it has already proved true, and would point to our numerous new churches built, and to our still more numerous organizations; but history tells us that church-building periods and church-life periods are not convertible terms; we want, in these days, more awakened consciences, not more secretaries and circulars. But God sent great men then when the world wanted them much; will He not now, when we want them more?

Secondly, does it not strike us that none of these revivalists thought to succeed either by intellect or wealth, but by the direct personal influence of man with man: by sharing men's sorrows, by sympathy with their sufferings, and by active help and comfort. Might not more be done now, if the clergy devoted less time to galvanising the few, and more time to visitation of and intercourse with the many? We need not copy St. Francis in mere externals; but could we not imitate his spirit? Could we not be known less as preachers on whom the flock promise (but do not always keep the promise) that they will "call," and more as friends who diligently call upon the flock? "The clergy," says Mr. Ruskin, "dine with the rich and preach to the poor; would they not accomplish more, if they dined with the poor and preached to the rich." Epigrams are not Acts of Parliament to be construed word for word; but is not

what Mr. Ruskin means perfectly true? Why had the Beguines, the Friars, the Waldensians, the Lollards, the Hussites, the Puritans, the Methodists a power which the Church too often has not had? Is it not because their lives were an incarnation of Christianity; they lived by laws of life after the mind of Christ. They cared much for the flock and little for the fleece. But in those times the people were without power, and could give little else but their love to those who lived for them, and sometimes died for them. What if some noble-minded man, with the spirit and power of St. Francis, should rise up within the church now when Demos is King? Demos would now be able to give him a power and a support such as would at no previous age ever have been possible. I think there is some hope in the thought. No doubt the argument cuts both ways; the clergy might become demagogues—about the basest possible specimens of bad humanity—but still I think the hopeful side predominates. For Dean Milman is right, there is a latent righteousness in the people.

Thirdly, it may be said all these orders degenerated, some lapsed into heresy. No doubt. But surely history teaches that God works by succession of good men, raised up within the organizations of the Church, without which such organizations become hard and unyielding, and must degenerate; as indeed history shows organizations always do degenerate. "The Church," says M. Guizot, "has exercised a very great influence on European civilization, but it has done so mainly by changing the dispositions of men." New men with new modes arise, but the old Christian spirit animates them; and wheresoever there is the spirit of Christ, there also is there life within the Church.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Choirmaster's Companion to Hymns Ancient and Modern." Third edition, price 6d. The Church Printing Company, 11, Burleigh Street, W.C.

Mr. Isaac H. Jeayes has here carried out the suggestion made in the Pulpit some time since, that an intelligent table of hymns based upon the Church's teaching would be a great boon and help to both clergy and choirmasters, who have seldom the time needful for making such a selection. Instead of the mere *numbers*, as given in the Pulpit, for *one* year, this little book gives the first line of each hymn, with a reference to the passage of Scripture for the day, Collect, &c., on which it bears. The compiler says truly "that at many churches the hymns are chosen with but little regard for the day's services; but that certain hymns, comparatively few in number, though justly perhaps favourites, are sung over and over again at short intervals, to the neglect of others more suitable and equally beautiful, if not so well known, which accords with our own remarks as to the hurried choice in the Vestry before service." Taking the "General Hymns," however, as an instance in point, we find here one hymn (179) given five times, twelve hymns four times, and twenty-two of the "General Hymns" altogether omitted. These discrepancies might be altered in a future edition, this being, we are glad to see, the *third*, while the price is now reduced from 1s. to 6d. There are six or seven hymns for each Sunday in the year, hymns for Saints' days and special occasions, including Days of Intercession for Missions, Hospital Sunday, and School Sunday. Hymns for School Sunday are one of the notable omissions in Hymns Ancient and Modern, and ought to have been provided in the recent supplement. It should be noted that this supplement is not quoted at all. Certainly Hymns Ancient and Modern is the hymn book of to-day and of the past twenty-five years; but it is not likely to be the hymn book of the future.

"Robert Brett (of Stoke Newington), His Life and Work." By T. W. Belcher, D.D., M.D. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh. 10s. 6d.

This is the life of a very interesting man—a medical practitioner, an earnest Church worker, and a sincerely religious man; the author of some devotional books, amongst which are "The Doctrine of the Cross," "Reflections, &c. (with Gospel Harmony), on the Life and Passion of Our Lord," "The Churchman's Guide to Faith and Piety," and "The Power of the Catholic Faith," a privately printed memoir of his daughter, Maria. Mr. Brett laid too much stress on the forms and ceremonies of the Church of England, but was a constant and loving student of the Holy Scriptures, and seems only to have cared for Ritual for religion's sake. He was a spiritually-minded man, and one who was much respected and beloved by many.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

Sir,—Returning home after a brief holiday your issue of the 2nd inst. fell under my hand, and I naturally turned first to the correspondence columns. There I find a well-known contributor still engaged in the gallant, but futile, attempt to carry the above position without adequate means. Joseph's brethren at least took money with their sacks, when they went down into Egypt, and brave little David laid in a store of sling-stones when he went out to fight big Goliath. But your correspondent gaily goes forth without coin or ammunition. His courage is greater than his prudence. Before now I have endeavoured to warn him that, without a study of the Greek medical writers, his efforts would be useless. Whom does he hope to convince? As for myself, who sympathise with his thesis generally speaking, I regret to see his arguments open to no small charges of ignorance. It was inevitable under the circumstances. Will Mr. Heber Evans pardon me if I point out some of his mistakes in a friendly way?

His cardinal error is to trust to Dr. Hobart's quotations, as complete, exhaustive and impartial. The Doctor does not claim infallibility; indeed, he can hardly claim impartiality. He has overlooked some things which favour his views of St. Luke's medical pen, and he most certainly has closed his critical eye when treating of a good many words, which would damage his position. Without fear of contradiction I name, as a sample of the former, προσψαύειν, and of the latter, θηρίον, ἀναβαίνω, ἄκαρπος, ἀποτίθημι ἰσχύω, συνθλίβω, ἐκφύω. Unaware how defective Dr. Hobart's quotations are, Mr. Heber Evans

leans on this Egyptian reed, and exposes his ignorance. Take προσψαύειν, for instance. In your correspondent's letter I find it stated that the word is used "among medical writers only by Galen long after the date of Acts." Dr. Hobart has quite misled him. In his quotation from Galen's *De Anat. Administ.* vi. 8 (see p. 62) Dr. Hobart in fact overlooked, or omitted to state, that the words quoted as Galen's own are really a quotation by Galen from the works, now unhappily perished, of Herophilus of Alexandria, the founder of the medical school in that city. He lived three centuries at least before St. Luke. Again, Dioscorides (*Fac. Parab.* I. 176) has the following prescription for curing pensile warts :—ἐλατήριον μεθ' ἁλῶν λεῖον προσψανόμενος ἀκροχορδόνας αἴρει. Thus, through misplaced confidence, Mr. Heber Evans exposes himself to refutation in this matter of detail.

Again, take μέγας πυρετός, a phrase which he informs us "occurs only in Galen." This is an induction from Dr. Hobart (p. 4)—wrong again. Dr. Hobart's quotations, not being exhaustive, omit an important one from another medical writer, Aretæus (*De causis et signis morb. acut.* II. 2) ἐκ μεγάλων καὶ καυσωδέων πυρετῶν. What a mistake it is to take one's knowledge second-hand, and not to go straight to the medical authors themselves, should be as evident now to Mr. Heber Evans as it must be to your readers. For these two instances, which are not of my choosing, are but samples of Dr. Hobart's defective quotations.

As your correspondent promises to discuss μέγας and σμικρὸς πυρετός in another letter, it would perhaps be a kindness to hoist the signal "danger" before other Hobartian pitfalls. Thus (p. 4) we are informed on the authority of Galen "that it was usual with the ancient physicians to distinguish fevers by the terms μέγας and μικρός." Now this is a half-truth, and misleading. What Galen (*De diff. febr.* I. 1) does say, is this : "It is already usual among doctors to give these names μέγας and μικρός πυρετός to this kind of difference of heat, improperly using quantitive words in a matter of quality ; still the custom exists not in the case of fever only, but in thousands (μυρίοι) of other cases, where μέγας and μικρός are used to designate what is in fact qualitative." Apparently, the Greek doctors adopted the loose terminology of their patients, and gave it a different meaning, though what that is is not very clear. One thing is certain—these adjectives were used for all sorts of diseases and of the commonest use. If μέγας could be called technical at all, it was in anatomical phrases, with such words as ἀρτηρία, φλέψ, κοιλία, μύλαι (molar teeth) and κανθός (corner of the eye). With πυρετός it was not technical, but popular, except in the sense of implying a different kind of heat as the motive cause of the fever, or in the sense given in Galen's *Comm. in Hipp. epid.* III. 5. "Some," he says, "distinguish between small, medium, and great fevers by the number of hours occurring between the attacks." This distinction is rational and properly medical, as it implies observation and experience. But was either of these ideas in St. Luke's mind when he wrote πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ? Who can say? If the older Apostolic tradition of the healing of Peter's wife's mother is correctly given by Matthew and Mark, why does St. Luke change the very excellent medical word πυρέσσειν, to be feverish, into συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ? Why intensify the complaint? Is it the index of a later tradition? And could a later tradition, whether transmitted to us by a professional or an unprofessional pen, do more than popularly magnify the disease for the exaltation of the healer?

If it be maintained that συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ must be from a medical pen, how much more medical was Josephus (*Antiquities* XIII. 15, 5), who tells us that "Alexander the king fell ill through drunkenness, and for three years suffered from quartain fever," τεταρταίῳ πυρετῷ συσχεθείς· Now τεταρταῖος, with, or, indeed, without πυρετός, was the well-known intermittent fever, frequently found in medical writers, and occurring particularly in Galen's *Definitiones Medicæ*, among the eighteen named and defined fevers (106-205), where, be it observed, πυρετὸς μέγας is not found. It does not, therefore, in his opinion, rank with them as a technical term.

However, I have said enough to assure Mr. Heber Evans that I will read with interest what he has to say on πυρετὸς μέγας and μίκρος, and if he will kindly give a paragraph or two to the plural form, πυρετοί, of Acts xxviii. 8, I shall probably be able to add a few remarks.

F. T. P.

"I PERCEIVE THAT VIRTUE IS GONE OUT OF ME."—LUKE viii. 46.

SIR,—I beg leave to say a few words on this utterance of our Lord. I do not argue that the grace went forth without His volition, though it looks like it. But I pass that over. In a preceding chapter—Luke vi. 19—we read that "the whole multitude sought to touch Him, for there went virtue out of Him and healed them all." The woman touched, not His body, but only His garment. All the multitude thronged Him, yet virtue went out only to those who had faith to be healed. How was this? Thus though grace accompanies the bread, yet those only benefit by it who are in a state to do so, *ad modum recipientis*, We had a very learned document put forth in Ireland during our Revision Crusade, called "Report of Master Brooke's Committee." In this we are told that if grace accompanies the bread, it must be withdrawn in the case of the unfit. I commend the learned authors to the case in the Gospel. Was the healing grace withdrawn as to all the unfit, or was it their unfitness that "*ponit obicem*"? That same revision report tells us that there is no mean between God and the soul except faith—no mean on God's part, as the Catechism makes water and the elements in the Eucharist. The writers might as well say that the garment was no mean, but the woman's faith alone. Ritualists tell us that we must have actual contact with our Lord's Body in the Eucharist, that the bread with the grace, which St. Paul calls His Body, will not suffice. As well say that the garment was not enough to the woman unless she touched His Body. This is all vain philosophy. On the other side, we are told that the bread cannot be a veil, or form, unless something solid be beneath it, as if they would drive all who hold a real presence of grace, into avowing a corporal presence to be adored. But this also is vain philosophy. Was the garment a veil or form for conveying the cure? Was the cure anything solid? The cases are analogous. Grace from heaven may come under the veil of bread, though it is nothing material or substantial.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Armitage, Rev. Robert, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces at Aldershot ; Chaplain at Wellington Barracks.

Astley, Rev. H. J. Dukinfield, M.A., Association Secretary of the Missions to Seamen Society for the North-West Counties ; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.

Biggs, Rev. Ernest Coltier, M.A., Vicar of Trimdon, Durham ; Vicar of Thornley.

Bird, Rev. Edward Trevor, M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Bedford ; Rector of Farmington, Gloucestershire.

Buckle, Rev. William Foster Ray, M.A., Chaplain at Wellington Barracks ; Chaplain to the Forces at Malta.

Butlin, Rev. Wilson Griffith Brougham, B.A., Curate of Camden Church, Camberwell ; Vicar of Donington, Lincolnshire.

Chaffers-Welsh, Rev. Jeremiah, Chaplain and Private Secretary to the Bishop of Sydney.

Challenor, Rev. John William, Clerk in Orders at Manchester Cathedral ; Sunday Evening Lecturer at St. George's, Altrincham.

Cooke, Rev. John, Minister of St. John's Church, Littlehampton.

Everest, Rev. William Frederick, B.A., Hon. Canon in Truro Cathedral.

Goddard, Rev. Thomas Ward, M.A., Rector of Bitteswell, Leicestershire ; Vicar of Nazing.

Godson, Rev. George St. Alban, M.A., Vicar of Moulsham ; Chaplain of the Chelmsford Union.

Grub, Rev. George, Incumbent of St. James's, Stonehaven, and Synod Clerk of the Diocese of Brechin ; Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Ayr.

Hawkins, Rev. Bradford Robert John, B.A., Curate of Crowfield, Suffolk ; Vicar of Skelbrooke, Doncaster.

Hewlett, Rev. A. S., Licensed to Preach in the Diocese of London.

Hodgson, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Head Master of Huntingdon Grammar-School, and Curate of Brampton ; Rector of Eynesbury.

Horsley, Rev. Edward Lamont, B.A., Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk ; Rector of Burnet.

Jenner, Rev. Edward Herbert Fuller, B.A., Chaplain to the Forces at Dover ; Chaplain at Chelsea Barracks.

Keely, Rev. Alfred William Johnson, B.A., Rector of Greete, Tenbury.

Lester, Rev. J. M., Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Ayr ; Vicar of Shifnal, Salop.

Maule, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Eynesbury, Hunts ; Vicar of Privett, Hants.

Mayor, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Thornley, Durham ; Vicar of Shotton.

Mitford, Rev. William Ledwich, M.A., Curate of Looe, Cornwall ; Vicar of Mullyon.

Napier, Rev. John Russell, B.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Preston ; Vicar of Walsden.

Norden, Rev. Henry Louis, Rector of St. Clement-with-St. Edmund, Norwich ; Vicar of Billingshurst.

O'Neill, Rev. O. A. W., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth-class ; Chaplain to the Forces, Third-class.

Palmer, Rev. Charles Samuel, M.A., Rector of Eardisley, and Rural Dean ; Prebendary of Colwall in Hereford Cathedral.

Parker, Rev. James, Vicar of St. Thomas's, Groombridge, Tunbridge Wells ; Vicar of Knighton, near Leicester.

Peacock, Rev. Reginald, M.A., Curate of Huntley, Gloucester ; Vicar of Woodlands St. Mary.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beard, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Rector of Greenford, on the 3rd inst., aged 66 years.

Dale, Rev. Samuel, Vicar of Walsden, at Ventnor, on the 24th ult., aged 53 years.

Hardinge, Rev. Sheffield, B.A., Rector of Barrow, Chester, at Barrow Rectory, Chester, on the 5th inst., aged 50 years.

Lambrick, Rev. Samuel Stratford, Vicar of South Muskham, Newark, at the Vicarage, on the 31st ult., aged 60 years.

Palairet, Rev. Charles, formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, at Norton St. Philip, on the 3rd inst., aged 87.

Ponton, Rev. Thomas Graham Weir, at Worthing, on the 2nd inst.

Wroth, Rev. Charles Cockayne, Rector of Tourmakeady, county Mayo, on the 12th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SUBDUING THE BODY.

By the Ven. Archdeacon FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday, July 20th, 1890.

"Whosoever doth not bear his own cross and come after Me cannot be My disciple."—Luke xiv. 27 (R.V.).

MY object this afternoon will be to try to impress you with the awful necessity for something more real and more serious in religion than this age affecteth. If we are to be Christians, if we are to inherit eternal life, if we are to enter into the Kingdom of God, if we are even to keep the Commandments, it can only be at the cost of greater and more serious effort than most of us evince. There are many Christians who seem to think that their Christianity is ample so long as they are personally respectable, so long as they abstain from anything which would be called a heinous vice or a flagrant crime; and yet all the while their aims may be of the earth earthy, their thoughts may be low, their lives may be altogether mean and ignoble. There are masses of Christians—it seems a sad and terrible thing to say, and yet it is true—to whose Christianity Satan has no sort of objection. It does not do him any harm. It does not disturb him in the possession of his kingdom. It does but lull them to sleep in a more dangerous self-deception. Was it not of Christians that St. Paul said, "For many walk of whom I told you before, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose God is destruction, whose glory is in their shame, whose end is perdition"? And as we look around us upon the state of our modern society, is it not true that there are multitudes of the youth of England, who are called the "gilded youth," who seem to devote their whole lives to personal amusement and self-indulgence, who, through the whole of their evil and ill-flavoured lives, never give to any good object, never strike a blow for any noble cause, never say one single word, or do one single deed, to make man purer or woman nobler? and yet, at the end, they perhaps think, in their complete self-satisfaction, that it was to produce this type of manhood and this range of perfection that Christ died?

And are there not multitudes of the youths of the lower classes who rarely enter a church, who never come to Holy Communion, who bet and drink and gamble, and spend their lives or their leisure in the public-house or in the music-hall, and then, perhaps, lightly, unadvisedly, wantonly, marry with thriftless senselessness, and burden the groaning nation with the squalor and misery of a pauper family, and yet think that they have been respectable Christians, so long only as they have never poisoned a child or broken open a till? And we, the common multitude—are there not multitudes of us who barely rise above the ledger or the counting-house, who are entirely absorbed by the dull, yellow fascination of gold, who scarcely ever struggle out of the narrow domesticity of a slightly expanded egotism? Are there not many of us who eat and drink and chatter and sleep and go on gathering and amassing, striving blindly, achieving nothing, and then die, perish, and no one asks any more respecting us, any more than they ask after the waves that foam in the moonlit solitudes? And yet, although, perhaps, we should admit that we are but drowsy candidates for amaranthine crowns, how few of us are there who admit the plain and simple truth that we are not in any true sense the followers of Christ—that we are not in any high sense worthy of the great name of Christians—that we are, in truth, drifting slowly and surely towards the icy gulf of moral and spiritual death?

And yet, my friends, if we follow the teaching of Scripture, we find that the whole of Scripture, and especially the New Testament, is full, from beginning to end, with the urgency of watchfulness. It is every single apostle and every single evangelist that tells us that we must watch. Now it is St. Peter saying: "Be sober, watch, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour." Now it is St. Paul saying, "Let us not sleep as do the rest, but let us watch." Now it is St. John saying, "Blessed is he that watcheth." And again and again our blessed Lord says to us, "Watch, for ye know not the hour at which your Master cometh." Ought we not to watch, lest on us should fall the terrible penalty of which Jesus speaks in so many of His parables—lest we should be like those faithless virgins who, with the ungirded loins and the unburning lamps, were sleeping and slumbering when at midnight the bridegroom came? Are we not afraid lest we should be like the rebel husbandmen, like the revelling servants, like the slothful steward? Does not our Lord say, "Watch, because you are surrounded by evil men and by perilous circumstances. Watch, because your lower nature is ever with you, and is ever a traitor with pathetic voice urging you to betray your Lord and Master?" "Watch," says St. Peter, in the words that I quoted but now, "because you have an active spiritual enemy who is ever seeking to destroy you." Therefore I purpose this afternoon to speak some few words about the duty of watchfulness; and I shall speak especially to the young. Besides the boys of our ancient and historical school, there are

many of the young in this Abbey. There are, above all, many young men, and I would fain give them, if I can, the counsels of one whose sun of life is beginning already to western towards the shadows of the evening.

I would tell them of the necessity of this watchfulness, because nothing will be more fatal to them than its neglect. And I would speak to them chiefly by example, that they may learn more by example than by speaking in the abstract of this great duty which I would impress upon you. I would ask all of you to go some time into our great National Gallery, and there to notice a small but beautiful picture by a master of whom very few works survive, painted some five centuries ago by Vittori Pisano. That picture represents the meeting of a youth and an old man; and if you look at it you will see by a little study that it is one of those deeply felt religious pictures of the Middle Ages which are intended to be a solemn allegory. The youth is St. George. He is clad in rich mediæval armour. The old man is St. Anthony. He is dressed in the brown robe of a monk, over which flows his long-down silvering hair. He has in his hand a staff and a bell, while the youth has his hand upon his truncheon, and by his side is his gilded, cross-hilted sword. At the feet of the youth there lies a dragon—foul, hideous, but dead. At the feet of the old man there lies a tamed wild boar. Behind them both there is a dark pine wood, and over them both is a vision of the Virgin and child. Now, what does the picture mean? Let me try simply to point out its meaning. Both the youth and the old man are victors. Both of them have won a great conquest, but in different ways. The dragon which lies at the feet of St. George, the wild boar which crouches at the feet of St. Anthony, are simply the symbols for those demon temptations which rise from the lower passions of the flesh, which the old man has absolutely dominated, and which the young man, by one fierce effort for the time, has wholly slain. The staff in the hand of St. Anthony indicates that he is, indeed, a pilgrim in the wilderness; and the bell which he rings vigorously with his left hand is to show his constant vigilance, because it was believed that "the evil spirits who rule in the air fear much when they hear bells ringen." And the two meet each other with surprise. The youth has short, curly, golden hair, over a face resolutely thoughtfully and nobly beautiful, to indicate that he is one of those who sat, self-governed in the fiery time of youth, obedient at the feet of law; and the old man has the hoary hair which is "a crown of glory when it is found in the way of righteousness." He seems to look upon the youth, and say, "Has that bright youth indeed won a victory over the temptations of the flesh?" And the youth seems to think, "Has that old man during these long years been able still to resist the world, the flesh, and the devil"? Yes, St. George is the Christian soldier who has won the victory by fighting; and St. Anthony is the Christian saint who has won the victory by long prayer and long self-denial. And the dark pine wood behind them is the dark wood of temptation upon earth, in which poor Dante lost his way in the middle of his life. And the vision over them is the beatific vision which always expands itself in heaven over all those who have fought, because, though there are "diversities of gifts," there is "the same spirit." The whole picture, then, is an allegory of Christian struggle and of Christian watchfulness; and let me employ our brief time this afternoon in trying to show you how in other ages there have been illustrious examples, who have, indeed, devoted every purpose of their lives to win over themselves a secure and tranquil mastery; and perhaps, by looking at other examples, we may be shamed into greater efforts. And, as I shall rather talk to you than preach a more formal sermon, I would earnestly beg of all you who are young, especially, not to give yourselves up this afternoon to that heavy, full-fed, sensual after-dinner sleep which we so often see in these afternoon congregations, but rather to listen for a time to see from these examples which I will set before you how the Christian athlete ought to be temperate, how the Christian husbandman ought to labour, and how the Christian soldier ought to fight.

Let me take my first example from that old man in the picture—St. Anthony. He takes us back a very long period of time. He lived in the third century after Christ. It was a terrible time. The Goths and the Persians were thundering on the confines of the empire, and in the midst of heresies and persecutions, and wars, and many complications, the troubles of the day were so grievous that many in the concerns of this life had entirely forgotten the concerns of the world to come. And then it was that St. Anthony felt that it was not a time merely to preach sermons to such an age as that about purity and unworldliness, but rather to set to his age a living example such as no man could possibly misunderstand. He was but a youth; he was an orphan youth; but there had come to him a sense of the unspeakable value of the human soul. He took Christ at His word. He sold all, and he went to live in the wilderness. He had an only sister, and He left her in a nunnery, and then, going into the desert, he strove to make in solitude the audience-chamber of God. He sought to be alone with the Alone. He wished to make his whole life, as it has been said, an ephod on which was inscribed the one word, "God." He did not expect to take with him himself, his youth, and the passions of his youth. He did not go into the desert to escape temptation. He went into the desert to struggle with it, and to wrestle, and to conquer, and to trample it under his feet. We are told that on one occasion, after he had been meditating on the awful fact that a man may gain

the whole world and yet lose his own soul, he heard a voice saying to him: "Arise, Anthony. Come and see." He went out and saw a monstrous form, reaching from earth to heaven, and all around it a number of winged souls striving to rise upward; but the monster incessantly clutched some of them and hurled them down to the earth again. Others beat their wings more rapidly, and they escaped. Anthony felt that he had seen a vision of the fate of human souls; and, surely, to a man who was so intensely in earnest, to a man for whom that vision was only the reflection of his own inward thoughts, any effort was easy. And we are told that, on another occasion, when he had been thinking of all that Christ had done for the ennoblement of the human race, and when he had been thinking of the terrors of the judgment to come, suddenly before his feet he saw a black child, and the child said: "I have conquered many; I have thrown down many; but, as in the case of many, so in thine, I have been entirely overcome." "Who art thou?" said Anthony; and the evil spirit answered in a lamentable voice, "I am the spirit of impurity." And Anthony said, "Thou art utterly despicable, but thou art indeed black of heart and weak as a child against all who struggle with thee; and henceforth I will not cast a single thought upon thee, because with the aid of the Lord my God, I shall triumph over mine enemies." And so Anthony, having won the immense victory over himself, became a life and a regenerating force to the age in which he lived. He taught other men besides himself that there was nothing which had so infinite a value as the soul of man, and he grew to old age, his eye still undimmed, his cheek still ruddy, his natural force still unabated. He gathered many disciples around him, till at last, feeling that it was time to set sail from hence, for he was now 105 years old, he bequeathed his sheepskin cloak, his only possession, to St. Athanasius, and then saying, "I perceive that I am called of the Lord," he humbly laid him down and died in peace. My friends, the life of vigil will always be followed by a death of victory.

I have given you an instance, then, of a youth who conquered the world. Let me give you the instance of a boy. St. Anthony had shown, as has been wisely said, that the foundation of individual freedom lies in self-sacrifice; but we are not meant to live alone. Man is meant to live in societies and in communities. Two centuries after St. Anthony, the storm of northern barbarism was pouring over the empire. It seemed as if morals, and art, and science, and religion, would be swept away, but in the midst of depopulated provinces and perishing institutions and homeless men, again God raised up another to show that the foundations of social freedom also lie in discipline and self-surrender. St. Benedict was a boy of the noblest birth, and when he was but fourteen years old—younger than almost any of you who hear me—he was sent by his parents to the great city of Rome. There were many who might have been dazzled by all the seductions and all the glare of the great city life, and rather pleased by its manifold temptations. Not so St. Benedict. His whole soul revolted within him against the pollutions of a nominally Christian society, and he fled from the great capital. He fled at first into loneliness, but the fame accompanied him that he wrought a miracle, and many gathered round him; and, therefore, once more he fled into the farthest depths of the Sabine mountains, and there, in an old cave where had once been an oracle of Apollo, he hid himself in a place in the hills far above the foaming waters of the River Arno; and there he was maintained for some time by a priest named Romanus, on bread and water; and there he endeavoured to win the mastery over himself. He, too, fought a fierce and long struggle, but he, too, won an absolute victory. One single anecdote may suffice, for I cannot stop to tell of how he left this cave for a time and went and founded his immortal order, and his immortal monastery on Monte Casino. I cannot tell you of the rules of that order, with its old triple vow of chastity in an age dying of orgies, of poverty in an age dying of opulence, and of obedience in an age perishing of disorder; or how he added to that vow his two rules, "*Ora et labora*," "pray and toil"; or how by that means he taught mankind that if, indeed, they would securely base the institutions of civil society, they must base them upon the principles of brotherhood, humility, and charity. But let this one tale show how it was that he exercised so magic an influence over his age and over the many ages that succeeded him. It is told that when still a boy in his cave he found that even then he had not entirely conquered the lower impulses of his lower nature, and, ashamed to find that his thoughts were still sometimes reverting to the seductions of Rome, he flung aside his sheepskin cloak, and ran forth, rolled his naked body in the thorns in order by that sharp anguish to tame for ever the stings of concupiscence. Seven centuries later St. Francis of Assisi visited that place, and grafted two roses on the old thorn-bed, and when I saw it a few months ago it was a garden of lovely and thornless roses; and at least the story, if it be not historical, as probably it is, will show you that those thornless roses grow only in the garden of the saints. At any rate, what a lesson there is in the example of that heroic enthusiasm! Do not thousands of modern youths think it perfectly safe to indulge themselves in reading evil books; in perpetually studying dubious newspapers; in being idle, self-indulgent, luxurious, well-fed; in listening constantly to the sound of jesting words; in letting their winged wishes rise and rove uncontrolled over every region of forbidden thought, and yet think that they can be faithful soldiers and servants of Jesus Christ? My brethren, heaven is not to

be had at such a price as that. It requires something more to save our souls from the enemies around us, even with the aid of the grace of Christ. If we think that we can so win these great victories, we are grievously and terribly mistaken. What said our Lord? He said, "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." He said "Strive"—(*agonise!*)—use your utmost efforts "to enter in at the strait gate"; and if we have not learnt the lesson, the great poets of Christendom, those great moral teachers, have learnt it thoroughly. You know how an Italian poet says:

> For not on rosy beds,
> Or under shade of canopy reposing
> Heaven is won.

And that great poet, who was laid early this year in his honoured grave, sings also:

> The sinless child lies on the flowering moss.
> 'Tis well for him that if a guilty man
> Envying such slumber, should desire
> To put his guilt away,
> Can he return to rest at once by lying there?
> Our sires knew well
> The fitting way for such dark souls—
> Dim lamps, a stone floor one may writhe on like a worm,
> No mossy pillow blue with violets.

The same thought is embodied in the hymn of our poet preacher, when He says:

> They climbed the steep ascent to heaven
> Through peril, toil, and pain,
> O God, to us may grace be given
> To follow in their train.

Let me give you one instance more. I have brought before you the example of a youth and the example of a boy. Let me bring before you the example of a young man. Look forward for seven centuries more, and in the thirteenth century you find a time sadly like our own. It was a time of much pomp and pride and luxury. It was a time when men were content too much with formal orthodoxy and outward ceremonies. It was a time of splendid ostentation in popes and princes, side by side with leprosy and squalor and misery among the masses of the people. And then, again, God raised a young man to set a glorious ideal, and to renovate the weakness and self-indulgence of the world. He was not called in early life. In youth St. Francis of Assisi was the gayest of the gay. He lived above his rank—like a prince's son. He was the bright leader of pleasure-loving companions. He was a singer, a soldier, full of many vain ambitions, but still never without some deeper hopes. But at the age of twenty-five he had a serious illness, and the voice of God called him, and he obeyed the voice. One day, as he was riding through his native valley, he saw a leper. He turned away, as haply some of us—as I grieve to say I myself—have done with irrepressible disgust when the horrible spectacle came before him; but immediately afterwards his conscience smote him. He turned back; he went to the poor sufferer; he filled his maimed hand with coins, and humbly kissed it and went upon his way. Looking back afterwards, the leper had vanished, and he was convinced that he had seen in the poor man the figure of Jesus Christ; and henceforth he saw Jesus Christ in all who suffer and all who mourn. He was misunderstood at that time in his work by a very worldly and unworthy father, a father who had no sympathy with anything that was high or noble; and at last he went into public, into the court, flung off his garments even to his hair shirt, and, covered by the bishop, who pitied him, with his pallium, he bore witness to all men that he was no son of Capro Bernardone, but was the servant of the living God. Then began his special work. He determined to take Christ as his absolute example. He would bring Christ out of the priest's consistory, out of the student's cell, out of the gorgeous cathedral, and bring Him into contact with all the wild and sordid conflicts of life; his life should be a true *imitatio Christi*; he would, even on the wild hills of Umbria, live as Christ lived on the hot plains of Gennesaret. He therefore set himself to his task, and worked nobly at it; and one day as he was standing silent under the starlight, a companion lightly said to him, "Are you thinking of a bride"? "Yes," he said, "of a bride richer, nobler, more beautiful than any whom your fancy can conceive." He was thinking of poverty—that is to say, of humanity in her sorrow, as his bride; and he, for the first time, took the conditions of the poor voluntarily as his own, as his Master, Christ, had done; and, just like St. Benedict, he gathered multitudes of disciples round him. He raised the whole tone of the age in which he lived; and when the time came for him to die he had shown the world that, whereas the world devotes itself wholly to three things—to riches, to honour, and to pleasure—he for his part taught that riches only overpower, and that honours distract, and that pleasures effeminate the heart, and that therefore some, at least, might choose, as their Lord had done, suffering instead of joy, self-abasement instead of glory, and poverty instead of riches. And when he had set that example, striking out into the thorny roads far above the flowery levels of humanity, he raised multitudes with him. So far from being repelled by this glorious fanatic, they crowded round him. They found that his words were full of glowing fire. They were anxious to listen to the lowest accents of his inspiration. He changed the whole current of his time and when he died, he died stretched out upon the grass in deep suffering, naked, until one, in pity, covered him with a garment; and, almost as his last words, he said to his followers, "I have played my part. May Christ enable you to play yours!"

Now in conclusion, my friends, perhaps you will say to me, "What use is it to speak of these sublime ideals of goodness? Are they not to us purely fantastic? Do you expect a single youth

here, like St. Anthony, to go into the wilderness, or, like St. Benedict, to tame the passions of his animal nature by physical suffering, or, like St. Francis, to give up everything for Christ?" No, my friends, I do not even expect infinitely smaller self-sacrifices than those. Those particular sacrifices are not what we are now asked to face. Times alter, conditions change. These great saints of God served God in ways which were consonant to their condition, and which were suited to their time.

> Wake again Teutonic father ages ;
> Speak again, belov'd primæval creeds ;
> Flash ancestral spirit from your pages ;
> Wake a greedy age to nobler deeds.
> Wake, but ask us not to be as ye were.
> All but God is changing day by day.
> He who gives to man the plastic spirit
> Bids him mould himself his form of clay.

We ask not for the actual deeds done by the saints of God. That were a childish thing to do. But we do say that in every saint alike, in every age, the spirit has been the same. It has been the spirit of resolute effort and complete self-denial. Are we wholly, even in this nineteenth century, without examples? To whose graves do men crowd in this Abbey? On whose statues do they look? Not by any means always on the statues of statesmen, whose names pass away and are forgotten. Not upon the graves or memorials of those who have been accidentally elevated or signally successful. No; but they stand beside the grave of David Livingstone, and think how, giving up everything for Christ, he went to live among those degraded savages, and was found kneeling dead upon his knees, having uttered his last prayer with no white face near him. And they look upon the statue of a man like Lord Shaftesbury, who did not give up his life to mean selfish indulgence and self-aggrandisement, but who all his life long was the friend of the oppressed and the champion of the poor. And whose will be the names that will be remembered in this our age? When hundreds and thousands of ephemeral reputations have been absolutely swept away, men will still remember a man like the unselfish hero who ended in the desert city the life which he had devoted for years to the care of his poor ragged boys. And they will remember the bishop who was murdered by the savages and sent with a palm upon his breast afloat upon the blue waters between the Coral Isles. And they will remember that other bishop who, in the prime of his hearty and joyous youth, was killed, but a year or two ago, in the heart of Africa. And they will think of him who went to die a leper among the lepers, and is buried in the leper isle and there enshrined—

> In such state to lie
> That kings for such a tomb might wish to die.

And can we not show, if not again the deeds of these, the spirit of these? At least, let me impress upon you, with all my heart, the sense that you cannot win the victory, you cannot do your duties in life, you cannot live worthily, unless you set before you the example of self-denial; and if you care not for the examples of these who have made their names harmonious in the great firmament of high examples, remember what St. Paul himself says to you, who, after all his life of labour and toil and self-denial, still wrote to his converts, "I conquer my body, and bring it into bondage"—

> "'Αλλ' ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ"

—literally, "I blacken my body with blows, and lead it about as a slave." Or, if even the example of the apostle be too little for you, take home at least the meaning of this text on which I have spoken this afternoon. Remember that these were the words of your Lord and Master whom you profess to follow, and that He said: "Whosoever doth not take up his own cross, and come after Me, cannot be My disciple."

THE Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has gone to Switzerland for a few weeks.

THE Bishop of Sodor and Man has returned to his diocese much improved in health by his visit to Aix-les-Bains.

THE Bishop of Swansea and the Dean-designate of Manchester have become patrons of the Incorporated Free and Open Church Association.

THE Bishop of Sydney and family were amongst the passengers on the steamship *Oroya*, which left Plymouth on Saturday, the 16th inst.

THE Bishop of Carlisle will be absent from England during the greater part of the month of September. Letters on necessary business may be addressed to the Archdeacons.

THE *Record* learns that the C.P.A.S. has recently received an anonymous donation of £800. A well-known friend of the society, in association with his wife, has recently given £250 to the funds, and a gentleman has offered £50 towards a new grant for a curate in a poor parish provided others will come forward and do the like.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1890.

THE CHURCH AND LABOUR QUESTIONS.

ALTHOUGH Dissent and practical Atheism are certainly not decreasing, the social power of the Established Church is now being recognised more prominently than heretofore. Business men are becoming less and less ashamed of being acknowledged as good Churchmen, and, impalpably but surely, the Church is realising that its clergy must no longer be mere exponents of sentimentalism or theological erudition, but of the hard logic of the Gospel. The "good Latiner" no longer inspires the wonder and admiration of a congregation; the curate of the Rev. Charles Honeyman type is fast disappearing. Men, whose brains are weary with the rapid daily evolutions of subtle worldly strategy forced upon them by the struggle for survival, are discovering that in addition to the repose of mind which the Order of Common Prayer is peculiarly fitted to produce, they may hope for some "kindly light" to be cast into the dark places of their minds by the thoughtful utterances of the clergyman. As a rule it is not the "eloquent" preacher, the man of grand perorations and gorgeous word-pictures, who strikes into the brain of the weary and heavy-laden man of the world the illuminating spark; it is he, so grandly described by the poet Cowper in his "Task"—"simple, solemn, grave," one who has reflected seriously on the mutability of all things human, and the immutability of the principles of good and evil. Such preachers are happily becoming more numerous, and their influence upon their generation is very marked.

The fear is, however, lest the Church should be dragged into the arena of debate and discussion upon passing events. That is not our ideal of its vocation. The Church, to our thinking, will lose its growing hold upon the thinkers and workers of the world the moment it attempts to assume, through its ministers, the position of advocate or even of umpire in any social question. With full acknowledgment of the excellent motives of Cardinal Manning, we cannot endorse his action in recent disputes between capital and labour. The priest steps from his pedestal as a deliverer of the Divine Word—the message which is not a command, not an award, but only an announcement of cause and effect—when he becomes, so to speak, a stakeholder between contending factions. We hope that, flattering as the proposal may be to the Churchman to be chosen as adjudicator between his fellow-men, he will always remember that the Church should never be exposed to be judged by merely human standards of right and wrong, which fluctuate according to the degree of intensity—often influenced by individual temperament—of the "fruits of the spirit," or the unregenerate passions of the mind. We shall watch forthcoming discussions on the right attitude of the Church to labour questions with great interest, and return to a further and fuller consideration of the subject.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

THE greatest, the most original, and the most picturesque figure of the ecclesiastical world of the Nineteenth Century is gone at last. His life has extended almost through that long period, and has embodied within itself the two prevailing tendencies of the age—a longing for clearness and certainty about man's relations to the higher world, and a restless inquiry after truth, directed towards the gratification of that longing, which seeks and studies through its best years in vain, and at last either resigns itself to the despairing conclusion that the highest and most valuable knowledge is unattainable by man, or else lays itself prostrate at the feet of that authority, which is most positive and most presumptuous in its claims. The two brothers, John Henry and Francis Newman, may be called an epitome of the religious mind of their age, quite similar in the processes of thought through which they have passed, entirely opposite in the conclusions which they have reached; each constitutionally a sceptic; the one depositing his scepticism at the feet of external authority, the other maintaining it to the end, constant and steadfast in recognising no authority, except the voice within. As the living brother stands by the grave of the dead, the Unitarian by the Catholic, the solitary thinker by the submissive subject of the greatest ecclesiastical despotism that ever existed in this world, how full of wonder do we feel at the example there displayed of the feebleness and fallibility of the human intellect, and how thankful that there is a Father above us, who understands, and appreciates, and loves, and will wisely and mercifully appraise, and reward, and finally enlighten us all! Churches, Catholic or other, may pronounce, if they will, that one of these two brothers must perish everlastingly. But our Heavenly Father, Who has made

truth so difficult of attainment, and man's mind so weak, and Who requires of His children, not to attain that which is beyond their reach, but to inquire honestly, and to speak the truth, has room in His heart and in His home for both John Henry and Francis Newman.

The active career of John Henry Newman has so long been closed by the exhaustion of old age, that we have learnt to look back on him as a man not of the present but of a preceding generation, and to judge him with the impartiality, and even tenderness, which are seldom applied to an old controversialist still engaged in the battle of life. We, of the Church of England, admire his great gifts, and, although Rome captured him from us, we still claim him as our own ; and we assert (what will hardly be denied) that all that was best and greatest in him sprung up, and flowered, and fruited on our ground, and that it was the work of English liberty and not of Roman despotism.

As we look back on his career, we feel inclined to ask the two questions—What was its morality ? and What was its success ?

With regard to the first of these questions, we cannot doubt that the extreme subtilty of his mind led him to justify to his own conscience acts which were morally unjustifiable. His fierce denunciations of Rome, uttered at a time when his mind was already half the captive of that enchantress, and which appeared to Hurrell Froude to be mere applications of the principle of *φενακισμός*, cannot be admitted to be consistent with Christian truthfulness. And it can hardly be doubted, that, for some years before he seceded, he was using the great influence, that he had acquired as a leader of thought in the Church of England, to draw the minds of pupils and juniors, who recognized him as their spiritual guide, away from her allegiance. On this point, the only excuse that can be alleged on his behalf is, that he himself did not see whither he was being led, that he was following where the "kindly light" was guiding him, never seeing more than one step before him. But such action is immoral in one who attempts to be a leader of thought. Such must see many steps before them, ere they can claim a right to guide other confiding souls. And such blindness to the real direction in which he was moving is hardly conceivable in a mind so clear and acute as his. It appears to us that his failing was the besetting fault of all ecclesiastical minds, a tendency to palter with strict veracity for the sake of objects, imagined to be good and holy. However, we do not desire to undertake the part of an *advocatus diaboli*. Let his faults and his virtues stand over for the judgment of God.

The success of his career may be variously estimated. His submission to the Church of Rome led many thousands of the higher class of English Society to the same allegiance. But the innate scepticism of his mind infected tens of thousands. It was the great catastrophe of his secession, and the unsettlement of minds which followed it, that led to the liberalising movement at Oxford and elsewhere, which he himself so bitterly deplored. Taking his work as a whole, we think that he effected less to strengthen that authority which he loved, than to promote that liberalism which he detested. Like the rest of us, he was an instrument in the hand of God, to promote objects which we cannot see, but which will be known hereafter.

If we compare him, lastly, with the leaders of the same school of thought in the present time, we are struck at once with the superiority, both of himself as a leader, and of the party which he led. This movement at the outset, and as long as it remained in his hands, was purely intellectual, moral, and spiritual. There was no ritualism in it. The idea never occurred to him of attracting the thoughtless and the worldly by pretentious ceremonial, and showy paraphernalia. The writer of this often attended his early communions at St. Mary's, Oxford ; where the service was perfectly simple, without even the eastward position, or any ceremonial in addition to what was universal in those days. His sermons were carefully studied, to a word, and to a tone. His manner was not affected, though artificial. Its cold thoughtfulness impressed and attracted numbers ; but others it repelled, amongst which last class was the present writer, who was then very young, and to whom it always suggested the idea of the touch of the torpedo fish, thrilling and chill. We could not imagine John Henry Newman uttering, or in any way encouraging, the shallow rhodomontades of the preachers of the present day. Every word he spoke had been weighed and measured before he uttered it. And it was to this careful preparation that he owed all his influence over those young minds, which had not, like those of the present day, lost their illusions and their hopes, but believed that Truth existed, and that they themselves were on the point of seizing it. We belong to different persuasions, and hold different conclusions on the most important subjects ; but we can appreciate both John Henry Newman and his brother ; and doubt not that we are members of one family, children of one Father, and that we shall hereafter share the same home.

CONFIRMATION AS A MEANS OF GRACE.

A Paper by the Rev. JOHN R. VERNON, M.A., Rector, St. Audrie's, Bridgwater.

The anxious, interesting, invaluable time comes, year after year, to us all, the time for preparing candidates for Confirmation. But does every Parish Priest rise to the greatness of the opportunity? Perhaps some words from a veteran may be, in this thing, useful to the less experienced.

The opportunity is priceless, the occasion unique, of kindly and confidential conference with the youth and maiden, at the stage of leaving boyhood and girlhood behind. School has been left, probably, for some time ; there has been, often, a break in the connection between the pastor and the young of the flock. But here, under quite different conditions, the old intercourse is resumed. They meet, now, not as scholar and teacher so much as in the relation of elder and younger friend. At least, the aim is, breaking through their shyness, to establish this relationship with them. Some have the rare gift of making the young people at once at home with them. But, with all, an earnest heart, full of love and longing for them, will do much to win their trust.

Then, how to impress them? Let us first, say, that there must be, in our own heart, an earnest belief in Confirmation *as a means of grace*. Our Confirmation teaching will be based, of course, on the Baptismal Covenant. We shall have been preparing our young people, years before, in school days, for this later and riper instruction. After the example of

Archdeacon Bather, in his never-equalled book on catechizing—we shall have impressed on their minds, God's part, and our part, in the Covenant of our Baptism. Its privileges, and its responsibilities. And then we shall just naturally, and in order, build upon the old foundation. And so, the confirming, ratifying, will be seen to have for its subject matter the Baptismal Covenant. Accordingly, in Confirmation, there will be God's part, and our part. Our part, the renewing, the confirming, our Baptismal vows. God's part, the confirming, increasing, the grace of Baptism ; the Gift of the Holy Ghost.

Now is there not rather a tendency in much of Confirmation instruction to dwell more on *our* part, the renewing of our vows, than on *God's* part, the *grace* of Confirmation? Take, for instance, Bishop Ashton Oxenden's "Are you ready to serve Christ?" It is a little book good to give to every Confirmation candidate, incomparable, so far as *one* side of Confirmation is concerned, *our* part in the conscious renewal of our vows. But mention of the *grace* of Confirmation is conspicuous by its absence. Yet, for our earnestness in teaching, for the effect we hope to produce upon our catechumens, it is of the utmost importance that we ourselves should believe in the definite and distinct grace given in the sacramental ordinance of Confirmation. In No. 940 of *Church Bells*, in Home Reunion Notes, a very interesting paper was given, concerning the grace of Confirmation. Probably the suggestions in that paper would convey thoughts new to many readers. But an erroneous impression might be left on the untaught mind by that paper. It might be thought that Baptism is a sacrament not complete in itself. That it needs the supplementary grace of Confirmation to complete it. That it is but the new birth of *water*, and Confirmation supplementary to it, needful to supply the complement—"water, *and the Spirit*." But there are more graces than one of the Spirit.

"He is the Spirit of Regeneration in Baptism, of Renovation in Repentance ; the Spirit of love and the Spirit of holy fear ; the Searcher of the hearts, and the Spirit of discerning ; the Spirit of wisdom and the Spirit of prayer. In one mystery He illuminates, and in another He feeds us ; He begins in one, and finishes and perfects in another. It is the same Spirit working divers operations."

So that we must ourselves believe, and so teach our candidates to believe, that Confirmation is not a mere *luxury*, Baptism being the *necessity*. No ; but that Confirmation *must* be had, where Confirmation *may* be had—else a grace, *the special grace of Confirmation*,—will be foregone.

So Jeremy Taylor :—*

"As God at first appointed to us the ministry of a *new birth*, so hath He given to His Church the consequent ministry of a *new strength*."

Let any one who has not fully taken in the thought of the proper and peculiar grace of Confirmation, read carefully this dissertation of good Bishop Jeremy Taylor, from whom we have quoted. The importance therein attached (in words gathered from the Fathers) to the grace of Confirmation, may astonish some, who, being teachers, have not given heed to become theologians.

That there is a definite gift to be given—an unction, a seal ; if we start with this conviction in our minds, we shall be the more likely to impress the conviction on the minds of our candidates. Let us dwell on the conscious and intelligent renewal of our Baptismal vow, as a most important part of our Confirmation. But let us not represent this as the be-all and end-all of this holy Ordinance. Let us make our catechumens to understand that we are not only to *offer*, but to *receive*, in Confirmation. In a short paper but little adequate can be said. But, besides Jeremy Taylor's treatise, let those who would be impressed read (in the Appendix to Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible") Frederick Meyrick's words on the "Supplement to Baptism," and there will be little fear that the mere ratification of Baptismal vows will be the *chief* or *only* element, in preparation for Confirmation.

To show what we may teach our catechumens to expect, to-day, in Confirmation, viz., the graces, if not the gifts, of the Spirit, let this quotation be given from Meyrick's article. They are weighty words, and bring before some of us forgotten or neglected truths.

"The Christian dispensation is specially the dispensation of the Spirit. He, if any, is the Vicar whom Christ deputed to fill His place, when He departed (St. John xvi. 7). The Spirit exhibits Himself, not only by His gifts, but also, and still more, by His graces. His gifts are such as those enumerated in the Epistle to the Corinthians—healing, miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, interpretations of tongues (1 Cor. xii. 10). His graces are :—

"'Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance' (Gal. v. 22, 23).

"The former are classed as the extraordinary ; the latter, as the ordinary gifts of the Spirit."

The former were for the convincing of heathens ; the latter, for the edification of Christians.

The former, for an Age. The latter, for all Time.

I. R. V.

* Jeremy Taylor "On Confirmation," "Works," Vol. V., p. 615, &c.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—I now invite attention to Dr. Hobart's Introduction (page xxxiii.), where he says : "This medical bias in the diction of the general narrative in the Third Gospel and Acts of the Apostles may be conveniently classified as follows :—

"(*a*) We find running throughout the history a number of words which were either distinctly technical medical terms, or commonly employed in medical language, *e.g.*, *ἴασις*, *θεραπεία*, *συνδρομή*, *συστροφή*, *ἀνάληψις*, *ἀποκατάστασις* *διάγνωσις*, *διαγινώσκειν*, *κραιπάλη*, *παρατήρησης*, &c."

Now I have already demonstrated that Dr. Hobart's assumption of a technical medical language is unfounded; and not one of the words he mentions above is peculiar to the medical writers, *ἴασις* (Job), *θεραπεία* (Genesis), *συνδρομή* (3 Macc.), *συστροφή* (Psalms), *διάγνωσις* (Wisdom), *διαγινώσκειν* (Numbers), all occur in the LXX. ; *ἀνάληψις* and *ἀποκατάστασις* are used by Plato, *κραιπάλη* by Aristophanes (the verb *κραιπαλάν* being found in Isaiah), while *παρατήρησις* occurs in Aquila, and also in Polybius, Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch. Dr. Hobart continues :—

"(*b*) It will be found that St. Luke runs on the

same compounds of the simple word which the medical writers employ, and that these are either for the most part peculiar to him, or that he makes more frequent use of them than the other New Testament writers, *e.g.*, διασείειν, κατασείειν, ἀνασείειν—περιπίπτειν, ἐμπίπτειν, ἐκπίπτειν, ἐπιπίπτειν, καταπίπτειν, συμπίπτειν, ἀποπίπτειν — ἐμβάλλειν, ἀναβάλλειν, ἀντιβάλλειν, διαβάλλειν, μεταβάλλειν, προβάλλειν, συμβάλλειν, ὑποβάλλειν, βολή, ἀναβολή, ἐκβολή—ἀποσπᾶν, ἀναπᾶν, διασπᾶν, περισπᾶν—διαστρέφειν, ἐπιστροφή, συστρέφειν, συστροφή, ὑποστρέφειν—ὀχλεῖν, ἐνοχλεῖν, παρενοχλεῖν, ὄχλον ποιεῖν, &c., &c." The writer of the Third Gospel is admitted by all to have been an observant, intelligent, educated man. He was, as Jerome says, *inter omnes evangelistas Græci sermonis eruditissimus.* He not only uses a great number of words—more than half of the 5,000 words in the Greek Testament occurring in the Third Gospel and the Acts—but he uses a great number of compound words; and the compound words that he uses were chiefly those which belonged to the current Jewish Greek of his day. The examples given by Dr. Hobart occur, with scarcely a single exception, in the LXX. Thus διασείειν is found in Judges and Job; κατασείειν in 1 Maccabees, and Bel and the Dragon; ἀνασείειν in Aquila, and also in *Hesiod*, *Thucydides*, *Euripides*, *Demosthenes*, *Aristophanes*, and *Diodorus*. *All* the compounds of πίπτειν mentioned by Dr. Hobart are to be found in the LXX.—in Genesis, Job, Psalms, or Isaiah. So, too, *all* the compounds of βάλλειν occur in the LXX., with the sole exception of ὑποβάλλειν, which is found in Polybius, the author of "the oldest and best work in the *common dialect*, based on the Attic, which dates from about 300 B.C." (Jebb.) So, too, βολή is found in Genesis xxi. 16; ἀναβολή in Nehemiah v. 13; while not only ἐκβολή, but the very identical phrase ἐκβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι (Acts xxvii. 18) in the same connection, namely, with reference to lightening a storm-tossed vessel by throwing the cargo overboard, is to be found in Jonah i. 5. The Jewish author of the Acts did not go to the medical writers for his words and phrases, but to his well-known and well-loved Septuagint version of the Jewish Scriptures. *All* the compounds of σπᾶν are likewise to be met with in the LXX. So, too, the compounds of στρέφειν: ὑποστρέφειν (Genesis viii. 7); διαστρέφειν, συστρέφειν both occur in Ezekiel (i. 13; xiii. 22), and elsewhere; ἐπιστροφὴ also occurs in Ezekiel (xviii. 28), while the word συστροφή, of which Dr. Hobart (p. 174) says, "peculiar to St. Luke, and used in medical language to denote 'a collection of tubercles—diseases,' &c.," forms in Acts (xxiii. 12), part of the phrase ποιεῖσθαι συστροφήν, which identical phrase is found in the Septuagint in Amos vii. 10. So, again, ὀχλεῖν occurs in 2 Maccabees, and elsewhere in the Apocrypha, ἐνοχλεῖν in Genesis, 1 Samuel, and Malachi, παρενοχλεῖν, in Judges, Psalms (xxxiv. 13), and Jeremiah. Dr. Hobart mentions ὄχλον ποιεῖν; but the word used in the Acts is ὀχλοποιεῖν; so elsewhere he considers σκληροτράχηλος (one word, used metaphorically of a moral disposition) as identical with the medical τράχηλος σκληρος of Hippocrates, meaning "stiff neck." Dr. Hobart is, I think, mistaken, though it would not be fair to say that he thus fails to distinguish between horse chestnut, and chestnut horse, or fee simple and simple fee. Winer, however, says that the latter word was probably one of those "coined by the Greek-speaking Jews or the New Testament writers themselves." Doubtless the same account is to be given of the word ὀχλοποιεῖν, which *really* does *not* occur in any of the medical authors, being found *only* in this one passage (Acts xvii. 5). The Septuagint, however, has the word ὀχλαγωγεῖν, which is very similar both as regards form and meaning (Amos vii. 16).

Dr. Hobart, page xxxiv., adds:

"(*c*) There are certain classes of words employed by St. Luke which were used in medical language in some special relation. Thus he alone uses the special medical terms for the distribution of nourishment, blood, nerves, etc., through the body, viz., διανέμειν διασπείρειν, ἀναδιδόναι; also the medical terms for 'to stimulate,' viz., ἐπεγείρειν, προτρέπειν, παροτρύνειν; and the terms to denote an intermittent or a failing pulse, viz., διαλείπειν, and ἐκλείπειν, etc."

All this, at first sight, is very impressive, and seems most convincing; but let us apply a little gentle criticism. First of all, we find that ἐκλείπειν is used in the Septuagint to describe the death of Abraham, the Founder and chief Patriarch of the Jewish race (Gen. xxv. 8). It occurs elsewhere in Genesis, and is also used in 1 Samuel, and in Isaiah and Jeremiah. We find that διασπείρειν is used very early in the LXX. to describe the dispersion of mankind after the Flood (Gen. ix. 19; x. 32). It is also found in the Psalms, and in Isaiah, and Jeremiah. The word ἐπεγείρειν occurs in 1 Samuel, 2 Chronicles, Isaiah and Jeremiah; διαλείπειν occurs in 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Chronicles, Isaiah and Jeremiah; ἀναδιδόναι occurs in Deut. xxix. 26, and is also used by *Pindar*, *Herodotus*, *Aristophanes*, and *Plato*; ἀναδιδόνα, occurs in Ecclesiasticus i. 22, and is also used by *Pindar*, *Thucydides*, *Herodotus*, *Xenophon*, *Plato*, *Aristotle*, *Polybius*, *Plutarch*; προτρέπειν occurs in Wisdom xiv. 8, and 2 Macc. xi. 7, and is also used by *Homer*, *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, *Thucydides*, *Xenophon*, *Plato*, *Aristotle*, *Plutarch*; while προτρύνειν (which is the only one of these eight words which is not in the LXX.), is to be found in the identical form in which it occurs in Acts xiii. 50 (the only place in the New Testament) namely, παρώτρυναν, in Josephus (*Ant.* vii. 6. i.). The word is also used by Pindar. What proof of professional medical knowledge can be deduced from all this? Do not these instances rather point to familiarity with the LXX., such as we should expect to find in a writer who tells us so much of Abraham and of Jacob, of Moses and of David, of the Temple and the Synagogues, of the Law and the Prophets, of the Pharisees and the Publicans, of the Chief Priests and the Scribes, of the Feasts and the Fast, of Circumcision and the Sabbath Day? Let me once more positively assert that the writer of the Third Gospel was not a trained physician, but only a devoted Jew, who had become a devoted Christian.

Dr. Hobart next refers to the phrases.

"(*d*) We meet," says he, "with the same combination of words as in the medical writers." I devoted my last letter to an examination of the phrases, reserving a few for fuller consideration.

Dr. Hobart continues:

"(*e*) There are some words which are confined to St. Luke and the medical writers in the sense which they bear in his writings, *e.g.* ἐνισχύειν, 'to impart physical strength,' εὐφορεῖν, 'to be productive.'"

Certainly there are some words in Dr. Hobart's list which are *not* used by the medical writers *in the same sense* which they bear in the Third Gospel and the Acts; *e.g.*, τὰ ἐνόντα, συστέλλειν, σκάφη, δοχή, περιτρέπειν. "F. T. P," in the PULPIT of March 8th,

said that "a goodly list can be made out of words used by medical writers in one sense and by St. Luke in another sense, and that generally the sense of the other New Testament writers."

With regard to ἐνισχύειν, Dr. Hobart himself points out that it is used in the LXX. in the same sense as that which it bears in St. Luke's writings. "It is remarkable," says he, "that, outside the LXX., its use in the transitive sense 'to strengthen,' is confined to Hippocrates and Luke." Wetstein's note is *sæpe dicunt* LXX., *ex aliis non laudatur*. There is only one medical authority quoted by Dr. Hobart—and that one is Hippocrates. The writer of the Third Gospel had no need to go "outside the LXX." for the "transitive meaning he required."

The word εὐφορεῖν occurs in the same sense in Josephus—a Jew, contemporary with the writer of the Third Gospel (Bell. Jud. ii. 21).

Dr. Hobart continues :

"(*f*) There are other words which are very rarely used by any except medical writers in the sense which they bear in St. Luke's writings, *e.g.*, ἀνακαθίζειν, 'to sit up,' ἐκψύχειν, 'to expire.'"

This word ἐκψύχειν, "to expire," as Dr. Hobart himself mentions, page 37, "is also met in the LXX., Ezekiel xxi. 7." What need to search further? But if we do, we find that it is also one of the 315 words used by Hippocrates, the Father of Medicine. With regard to ἀνακαθίζειν, Dr. Hobart, page 11, remarks :—"St. Luke uses this word again (Acts ix. 40) of another person restored to life, and sitting up in bed. And in this intransitive sense its use seems, with a few exceptions, to be almost altogether confined to the medical writers, who employ it to describe patients sitting up in bed." What then does Dr. Hobart say of Plato in the *Phædo*, using ἀνακαθίζειν in speaking of Socrates, and in connection with the word κλίνη = bed? Xenophon also uses the word intransitively. What proof is all this of technical medical training in the writer of the Acts?

Dr. Hobart further says :—

"(*g*) The medical style of St. Luke accounts for the very frequent use made by him of some words—a peculiarity which has been noticed by Dr. Davidson (*Introduction to the New Testament*), and others—*e.g.*, προστιθέναι, ὑποστρέφειν, σύν, διέρχεσθαι, &c., these words being habitually employed, and indeed almost indispensable, in the vocabulary of a physician."

It is unfortunate that Dr. Hobart should have taken as his first example here, a word which is used in the Third Gospel in a way which *Winer* (who, as an authority on Biblical Greek, has never been superseded) declares is "a *pure* Hebraism," and "opposed to the spirit of the Greek language." (See letter No. I.). As for ὑποστρέφειν it occurs twice in Genesis (viii. 7; xiv. 17), and in the New Testament is used by St. Mark and St. Paul, and also occurs in Hebrews and 2nd Peter. Moreover, it is found in *Homer* and *Herodotus*, in *Euripides*, *Thucydides*, and *Xenophon*.

No argument is to be founded on the use of a common preposition like σύν. The writer of a long and important history must use, as often as he needs, such very ordinary words to express his meaning. St. Paul uses σύν at least thirty times, and it occurs pretty often in his compound words—notably in Ephesians; but we must not, on that account, make St. Paul a physician. The last word mentioned (διέρχεσθαι) is found in *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*, *Joshua*, *Judges*, 1 *Samuel*, 1 *Kings*, 1 *and* 2 *Chronicles*, *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, *Canticles*, *Lamentations*, *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Micah*, *Amos*, and fills *three* columns in Schleusner. It would, therefore, appear to have been "habitually employed, and indeed almost indispensable in the vocabulary" of a Greek-speaking Jew—no less than in that of a physician.

Dr. Hobart further says :—

"(*h*) This medical tinge in St. Luke's diction will account for his making freer use than the other New Testament writers of compound verbs, and also of those compounded with two prepositions—*e.g.*, ἐπανέρχεσθαι, διεξέρχεσθαι, such compounds being much employed by the medical writers."

On turning, however, to Winer, "Grammar of New Testament Greek," p. 127, I find that "In Biblical Greek we meet with many compounds and double compounds, which do not occur in Greek authors. In particular, we find the simple verbs of earlier writers strengthened through the addition of prepositions, which, so to speak, exhibit to the eye the mode of action; as, indeed, a love for what is vivid and expressive is a general characteristic of the later language." The word ἐπανέρχεσθαι is to be found in Gen. xxxiii. 18, while διεξέρχεσθαι also occurs in the LXX., in 2 Samuel, Job, and Ezekiel.

Dr. Hobart adds :—

"There are, in St. Luke's writings, several other indications of the author being a medical man, which cannot strictly be classed under any of the above heads. Such are the marking of time by the words ὄρθρος, μεσημβρία, ἑσπέρα, μεσονύκτιον; the variety of words employed to describe the beds and stretchers for the sick—κλίνη, κλινάριον, κλινίδιον, κράββατος, the use of δραχμὴ and μνᾶ, the common terms for medical weights, to denote money, &c." But the word δραχμὴ occurs in Gen. xxiv. 22 (the history of Rebecca), also in Exodus, 1 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and 2 Maccabees; while μνᾶ is to be found in 1 Kings x. 17 (the history of Solomon), also in Ezra and Ezekiel.

With regard to the variety of words for beds, &c., κλίνη occurs in Gen. xlviii. 2 (the history of Jacob), and elsewhere in the LXX.; κλινίδιον is found in Aristophanes, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Plutarch; κλινάριον in Aristophanes and Arrian. Dr. Hobart does *not give a single instance* from the medical writers of the use of κλινίδιον, κράββατος, κλινάριον. These words are only κλίνη in a twofold diminutive guise—diminutives formed in ἄριον being "often in use with those formed in ἰδίον" (Matthiæ); κράββατος is found also in St. Mark and St. John, and occurs in Aquila's version of the LXX. It is said to be a Macedonian word, and the Latin form, *grabatus* (=a mean bed, in use among the poor), is to be found in Cicero and Martial. Bengel expresses the difference between κλίνη and κράββατος (which occur together in Acts v. 15) thus: *Lectus sumptuosior: grabatus tenuior.* What is there distinctively medical about any or all of these words—κλίνη, κλινίδιον, κλινάριον, κράββατος? Nothing at all. Nor is there anything distinctively medical about the words marking time; for ὄρθρος and μεσονύκτιον both occur together in Ps. cxviii. 148; μεσονύκτιον and μεσημβρία both occur together in Isaiah lix. 10, and μεσημβρία and ἑσπέρα both occur together in Ps. liv. 17; and these passages are not the only places in the LXX. where the words are to be found.

Dr. Hobart's radical defect is, as I have said, that he takes so little account of the LXX. His idea of a technical medical language, particularly conservative in its character, has been already shown to be an assumption; his detailed proofs are found, on inves-

tigation, to be no proofs at all, inasmuch as they lead us not to the medical writers, but to the Septuagint.

H. HEBER EVANS.

August 4th, 1890.

P.S.—Although my letter is already too long, I must add a word or two in reference to the remarks of "F. T. P." in the current PULPIT (August 16th). "F. T. P." asks, "Whom does Mr. Evans hope to convince?" I answer, I hope to convince every unprejudiced reader who will carefully and calmly weigh the mass of evidence I have brought forward. He further says that "your correspondent goes gaily forth without coin or ammunition." Not so. During the last seven years I have devoted much labour to a microscopic study of the phrascology of the Greek Testament (especially of the Third Gospel, the Acts, and St. Paul's Epistles), and also of the Septuagint. Nearly six years ago I pointed out that "the radical defect in Dr. Hobart's laborious work was that he took so little account of the Septuagint," and during the last twelve months I have been making a special investigation of his so-called proofs. Dr. Hobart's book, endorsed as it is by such well-known Biblical scholars as Dr. Salmon and Dr. Plummer, is the most exhaustive, the most impressive, and the most recent argument in favour of the medical authorship of the Third Gospel, with which I am acquainted. That theory I have ventured to challenge, and the book which most thoroughly embodies that theory I have endeavoured to criticise. I am satisfied that no other writer (not even "F. T. P.") will ever collect more convincing evidence (either as regards quantity or quality) than Dr. Hobart has collected and marshalled in his imposing volume. No other writer will ever succeed in presenting a more plausible case. What I contend is that Dr. Hobart's statements and arguments, convincing as they appear, will not stand the test of searching criticism, and entirely fail to establish the medical theory.

There can be no doubt that as a whole Dr. Hobart's quotations from, and observations on, the medical writers are correct. He has taken immense pains with his book, which certainly may be accepted as being perfectly trustworthy, although not absolutely exhaustive. Dr. Hobart does not profess to give every example of the medical use of a word. It is therefore scarcely fair to speak, as "F. T. P." speaks, of "samples of Dr. Hobart's defective quotations." Nor is Mr. Evans so wrong or even so ignorant as might be imagined from "F. T. P.'s" letter. My criticisms are directed against the arguments and evidence adduced by Dr. Hobart. If, when these have been confuted, other arguments and facts still remain in the background, by all means let "F. T. P." bring them forward that they share the same fate.

"F. T. P." speaks of Mr. Evans "exposing himself to refutation in this matter of detail"—*i.e.*, that the other medical writers besides Galen use προσψαύειν. Well, as "F. T. P." points out, it is only a matter of detail which cannot possibly affect my main lines of argument.

Moreover, the point of my statement was to the effect that the *phrase* προσψαύειν τῷ δακτύλῳ (Luke xi.) was not to be found in Dr. Hobart's quotations from the medical writers. This statement is perfectly correct, and consequently does not admit of "refutation."

And it does not appear that "F. T. P." has discovered the phrase in any of the medical writers. As to the word προσψαύειν itself, as it occurs in Pindar and Sophocles, it was public property before any of the medical writers had a chance of using it. The minute criticisms and philological disquisitions which "F. T. P." offers as *amicus curiæ* are interesting, but they have really very little to do with my argument. I am inclined to think, in spite of the precedent in "Midshipman Easy," that a "triangular duel" is not perhaps the most convenient arrangement for controversy; and, as I have already said, while any additional light "F. T. P." may be able to shed on the subject will be welcome, I propose to keep the even tenor of my way, and (when my task is ended, as no less than your readers I hope it soon will be) I shall be quite content to submit to the judgment of all competent critics the question whether my attempt at demolishing the medical myth has been "futile" or not.

H. H. E.

ARCHDEACON DENISON has written the following letter to a friend:—"I see no prospect of any Harvest Home this year. There is a large work to be done in the church, and though I can now manage to write slowly by my right hand, I cannot hold a knife to cut meat with, and I am generally obliged to be cared for by other hands, and write as few letters as I possibly can."

THE *Surrey Times* announces that the Bishop of Winchester has definitely decided to resign the bishopric, and has made domestic arrangements to leave Farnham Castle towards the conclusion of the present year. The severance of Dr. Harold Browne's long connection with the see, over which he has presided for more than seventeen years, will cause the greatest regret throughout the diocese. "The Bishop, who is at present staying at Blackmoor Vicarage, near Petersfield, will return to Farnham in about a month's time, and on leaving Farnham Castle will take up his residence near Southampton."

THE Dockers' Union is now acting upon the following important resolution, which has just been passed by the Executive, and largely circulated in the London labour market:—"That, recognising that our Metropolitan membership is quite equal to the labour requirements of London, resolved, that instruction be sent to each branch secretary in the Metropolitan area that no candidate for membership be accepted after 13th August, 1890, except by special sanction of the District Committee; and each District Committee to be informed that no men known to be physically weak or otherwise incompetent are to be accepted under any consideration. Special arrangements are to be made for the enrolling of those engaged in special industries, such as brewery men, sawyers, etc."—*The Standard*, Aug. 19th, 1890.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Carrington, Rev. Charles Walter, B.A., Curate of St. Clement's, Notting-hill; Diocesan Preacher and Missioner for the Diocese of Lichfield.

Churchill, Rev. Stuart, M.A., Senior Curate of St. Matthew's, Bayswater; Vicar of Birling, Kent.

Cogswell, Rev. William Henry Laurence, M.A., Vicar of St. Oswald's, Chester; Warden of the Diocesan Society of Special Service Clergy for the Diocese of Chester.

Cotton, Rev. James Stapleton, Member of the Diocesan Society of Special Service Clergy for the Diocese of Chester.
Evans, Rev. Edward Williams, Vicar of St. George's, Cullercoats, Northumberland ; Vicar of Maker, Cornwall.
Foster, Rev. John Priestley, M.A., Vicar of Poulton.
Griffiths, Rev. Benjamin Parry, M.A., Vicar of Llanwenog, Cardiganshire ; Vicar of Llanbyther, Carmarthenshire, also by dispensation.
Hicks, Rev. Edward Barry, M.A., Senior Curate of St. Nicholas Cathedral, Newcastle-on-Tyne ; Vicar of Killingworth.
Hoyle, Rev. Joshua Fielding, B.A., Curate of Whitby ; Vicar of Far Headingley, near Leeds.
Hudson, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of East Gilling ; Rural Dean of Helmsley.
Isaacson, Rev. Solomon, Vicar of North Frodingham, York.
Jones, Rev. David Daniel, B.D., Vicar of St. Paul's, Llanelly ; Rural Dean of Kidwelly.
Jones, Rev. William Morgan, B.A., Minor Canon of Bangor Cathedral ; Diocesan Inspector of Schools.
McCubbin, Rev. John Gerrard, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Longsight ; Priest-in-Charge of St. Andrew's Mission, Uddingston, near Glasgow.
Mitchell, Rev. James Le Fleming, M.A., Licensed (third year) in the Diocese of St. Albans.
O'Brien, Rev. Philip Stephen, D.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Somer's-town ; Vicar of Camden Church, Camberwell.
Oliver, Rev. George, B.A., Vicar of St. George's, Darlaston ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Lichfield.
Pollock, Rev. Herbert Charles, M.A., Vicar of St. Leonard's, Newark-on-Trent ; Rector of West Hackney.
Puttock, Rev. Edward Henry, M.A., Rector of Halwill, North Devon.
Robinson, Rev. Frederic, M.A., Senior Curate of St. Peter and St. Paul, Teddington ; Domestic Chaplain to Sir Massey Lopes, Maristow, South Devon.
Robinson, Rev. Prebendary, Vicar of North Petherton and Rural Dean ; Vicar of Chard.
Rodd, Rev. Henry Tremayne, B.A., Hon. Canon in Truro Cathedral.
Sheppard, Rev. William John Limmer, B.A., Curate of Christ Church, Timperley ; to the Charge of St. Elizabeth's Mission Church, in the Parish of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Altrincham.
Sheriffs, Rev. Frederick Markland Percy, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Barnabas, Wellingborough ; Vicar of Prestwold, Leicestershire.
Smith, Rev. Clement, M.A., Rector of Washfield, Devon.
Smith, Rev. William Mower, B.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Walkden Moor ; Head Master of Farnworth Grammar School.
Swayne, Rev. William Shuckburgh, B.A., Curate of Stalbridge, Dorset, Diocesan Preacher and Theological Lecturer in the Diocese of Lichfield.
Tidswell, Rev. Samuel Waite, M.A., Vicar of Knighton, Leicester ; Vicar of St. Thomas's, New Groombridge.
Towne, Rev. Lyndhurst Burton, Curate of St. Faith's, Stoke Newington ; Chaplain of St. Mary's College, Harlow.
Tracey, Rev. Harry Frank, Vicar of Dartmonth.
Watson, Rev. Herbert Armstrong, M.A., Head Master of Maidstone Grammar School.
White, Rev. Arthur Keble, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Bedford; Rector of Burley, Hants.
Williams, Rev. William, B.A., Curate of Llywel, Breconshire ; to the new district chapelry of St. Mary's, Traianglar, Breconshire.
Williamson, Rev. Samuel Thomas, M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Bolton ; Vicar of East Crompton, Oldham.
Wimberley, Rev. C. F. A., Senior Assistant-Master of Llandaff Cathedral School ; Head Master of the Choir School and Precentor of Holy Trinity Church, Kingston-upon-Hull.
Wright, Rev. Harold Hall, M.A., Curate and Precentor of St. Patrick's, Hove, Brighton ; Precentor of Chester Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Heberden, Rev. William, late Vicar of Broadhembury, Devon, at 14, Gloucester-place, Portman-square, on the 17th inst., aged 86.
Lawson, Rev. John, at the Vicarage, Seaton Carew, on the 10th inst., aged 82.
Smith, Rev. John William, Curate of Balham, Surrey, at hallacombe Rectory, Barnstaple, on the 13th inst., aged 39.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MOSES' INVITATION TO HOBAB.

By the Rev. B. MATURIN, M.A., Vicar of Lymington.

Sermon Preached in Lymington Parish Church, on Sunday, July 6th, 1890, and published by request.

"We are journeying unto the place of which the Lord said, I will give it you: come thou with us and we will do thee good: for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel."—Numbers x. 29.

THESE, brethren, are interesting and instructive words — instructive in the lessons which they are fitted and intended to convey to us who are pilgrims and strangers here upon earth, and specially interesting when taken in connection with the person, time and circumstances under which they were spoken. They were spoken by Moses, the great lawgiver of Israel, and the leader of the hosts of God's people, addressed by him to Hobab, the son of Raguel, the Midianite, Moses' father-in-law. Israel were now encamped in the wilderness, near to Mount Sinai. Moses, when called by God to go down into Egypt, had left his wife with her father Jethro, the Priest of Midian. About a year after the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt, Jethro comes to Moses in the wilderness, bringing with him Zipporah, Moses' wife, and her two sons. Moses goes out to meet them, and receives his father-in law with every demonstration of respect and esteem for his character; for we are told (Exodus xviii. 7) that "Moses went out to meet his father-in-law, and did obeisance, and kissed him; and they asked each other of their welfare." Jethro appears to have been a very good man, as well as a man of judgment and experience. Some, indeed, suppose that he was priest to the true God, as being a descendant of Midian, the son of Abraham and Keturah. He heard from the lips of Moses the story of God's wonders in Egypt, and "rejoiced for all the goodness which the Lord had done to Israel." "He took a burnt-offering and sacrifices for God; and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God" (Exodus xviii. 12). And after much happy intercourse and mutual counsel "Moses let his father-in-law depart, and he went into his own land." But Hobab, the son of Jethro, or Raguel, Moses' father-in-law, appears to have remained behind and assisted Moses in various ways. He, like his father, appears to have been a good man, and a pious servant of God. But he, too, proposes to return to his own land and kindred. Moses is loath to part with him, and, in the words of our text, he urgently and affectionately invites him to remain and cast in his lot with the Israel of God. "We are journeying," he says, "unto the place of which the Lord hath said, I will give it thee: come thou with us, and we will do thee good: for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel."

And here, you may say, the history ends; "Wilt thou not tell us what is this to us? How does it concern us Christians of the nineteenth century"? Why, I answer, Israel were a typical people—typical of the people of God in every age; in their journeyings and wanderings; in their trials and triumphs. In all the varied dealings of God with them, we have before us, as it were, an object lesson in which we can read the dealings of God with us. Looking at the subject in this light let me set before you (1) the journeyings of Israel as typical of the journeyings of the Christian, (2) and then we shall look at the invitation of Moses to Hobab as an example for our learning.

I. In looking at the journeyings of the children of Israel in the wilderness, I observe that we, like them, *are journeying*—yes, and journeying through a wilderness. Life is a journey through the wilderness of this world—from the first cry of the infant to the last groan of the dying man—every man and woman is on a journey from the cradle to the grave; from time to eternity. Some have lately set forward on their journey—have completed ten or twenty stages; and others, again, are drawing nigh to the close of their journey, and are nearing the Jordan of death that divides the wilderness from the land beyond—but all are on a journey. "Time by moments steals away first the hour, then the day. Small the daily loss appears, but it soon amounts to years." I am forcibly reminded of this when I state to you that I have this day—the first Sunday in July—completed thirty-eight years of my ministry in this parish. Most of those whom I am addressing had not entered upon the first stage of the journey of life when I came to this parish. May I not be permitted earnestly and affectionately to ask for an interest in your prayers at the Throne of Grace, that the Word of God spoken by me may have free course and be glorified in the conversion of sinners to the Saviour.

But it is not of life in general that I wish to speak, but rather of the life of the Christian as represented by the journeyings of the children of Israel.

I observe, then, that the children of Israel were journeying *from Egypt*. And what sort of a place had Egypt been to them? Why it was a place of slavery and bondage—a place in which, under the lash of their hard taskmasters, they were obliged "to serve with rigour"—"to make brick with

stubble instead of straw," it was a place of cruel oppression. And so the Christian is coming up from the bondage of sin and Satan—from the darkness of Egypt. "Ye were sometimes darkness," says St. Paul, when writing to the Christians at Ephesus.

The Christian can sing—

From Egypt lately come,
Where death and darkness reign,
We seek our new, our better home,
Where we our rest shall gain.

The galling fetters of his spiritual bondage have been burst, and, like Israel, he has come forth "harnessed out of the land of Egypt." So in the beautiful allegory of Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" we have the pilgrim escaping from the city of destruction, and when pressed by the entreaties of friends, or taunted and mocked by his enemies, he stops his ears alike to both, and cries, "I am escaping from the city of destruction."

I observe, again, the children of Israel were journeying *under a leader*. Moses was the chosen leader of Israel. He brought the people out of Egypt; he led them through the great and terrible wilderness, guided by the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night; resting or journeying as directed by God. "It came to pass when the ark set forward that Moses said, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate thee flee before thee. And when it rested, he said, Return, O Lord, unto the many thousands of Israel." And, blessed be God, the Christian is journeying under his Leader, Jesus Christ—"the Leader and Commander of His people." Israel was led by the Lawgiver; the Christian is led by Him who is the Author of grace. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." He leads His people as a shepherd leads his flock. He goes before them; they know His voice, they follow Him. He leads them "by the right way," often, indeed, through the terrible wilderness, as He led Israel of old, but always by "the right way." Blessed be God for such a Leader! Thorns and briers may beset the path of the Christian, but guided by Jesus, and directed by the pillar of cloud by day and the light of God's spirit by night, he goes on his way "as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing."

Lead, Saviour, lead, amid the encircling gloom;
Lead thou me on.
The night is dark, and I am far from home:
Lead thou me on.

But once more Israel was "journeying *to the place of which the Lord said, I will give it you.*" The land has made sure to Abraham by the promise and covenant of God with him; and although he had no possession in the land—"no, not so much as to set his foot on," yet he knew that his posterity would surely inherit the land; it was secured to him by the promise of God. He believed that promise, and "it was counted to him for righteousness;" and moreover the land was a good land—a land flowing with milk and honey, for "the Lord had spoken good concerning Israel."

And so the Christian is journeying to a place secured to him by the word and covenant of God with His people. They are "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." The place of their rest is made sure to them, for "God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath, that by two immutable things"—His word and His oath—"in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us."

And the place thus secured to them by the covenant of grace ("which is well ordered in all things and sure," for it is ratified and sealed with the blood of Jesus), is "a good place"—a place where "the inhabitant shall not say I am sick, the people that dwell therein are forgiven their iniquity." *Now* it is described as "My Father's house with many mansions;" *now* as a "city that hath foundations, whose Maker and Builder is God," the city needing no light of the sun by day or light of the moon by night, for the Lord God giveth them light, and they shall reign for ever and ever. The Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes. To this glorious place, this "land of pure delight, where Saints immortal reign" we are journeying; some have gone before, have crossed the Jordan of death, and joined the hosts of God's triumphant Church above! We are yet in the valley "fighting with the Philistines," journeying through the wilderness. "Marching through Emmanuel's land to fairer worlds on high," but the victory is secure, for Jesus is at once the Leader and Commander of His people, and He will lead them to a "City of Habitation."

"Thus God's people, like Israel of old, are journeying through the wilderness of life under Christ their Leader "to the place of which the Lord hath said, I will give it you."

II. But now let us attend to the *invitation* which Moses, gave to Hobab, his brother-in-law, to accompany him and Israel on their journey. How kindly and earnestly he speaks to him! "Come thou with us." He did not wish to part with him, and taking him by the hand, as we well suppose, he says to him, "Come, brother, come thou with us;" and in this Moses sets an example which the people of God in every age should follow, each Christian inviting his friend or his brother to "come with him" on his heavenly journey. It is the very spirit of Christianity to be communicative and expansive. He who hath tasted that the Lord is gracious, he who hath been made free with the

freedom with which Christ makes His people free, he who hath "passed from death unto life," from darkness into light, must needs, under the impulse of nature and of grace, desire to bring others to that Saviour that hath so blessed him. Thus Andrew, after his saving interview with the blessed Jesus, "findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, we have, found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ; and he brought him to Jesus." Jesus findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow Me. Philip findeth Nathaniel, and tells him the good news. "We have found Him, of Whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph;" and the woman of Samaria (bad as she had been) is no sooner made a disciple of Jesus, than, leaving her water-pot, she hastens back to the men of the city, crying, "Come, see a man which told me all things that ever I did; is not this the Christ?" Oh that there was more of this missionary spirit pervading the rank and file of the army of Christ, that each one in simple words would speak to his brother or sister telling "what God hath done for his soul," and saying, "Come thou with us;" come let us go up to the house of the Lord, and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths."

And now let us mark the *motives* that actuated Moses in thus urging his brother-in-law to remain with him. It was not only that Hobab might be of use to him, though he does not altogether pass that by, as he says, "Thou mayest be to us instead of eyes;" you will be useful to the Israel of God in remaining." And this will always have its weight with a good man. Can I be of any service to the Church and people of God in taking up my abode in such or such a place. It is a grand thing to dedicate all the power or talent that God has given us to the service of God and His people. But Moses specially pleads with Hobab to remain from a consideration of the *blessings he would receive*. "We will do thee good." "The Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel, and it shall be if thou go with us, yea, it shall be, that what goodness the Lord shall do unto us, the same will we do unto thee" (x. 32). And so in kind, earnest, and affectionate words he pleads with Hobab to cast in his lot with the Israel of God, assuring him that the step taken would be attended and followed with blessings to himself.

And it is in this way, and moved by such motives, that each Christian should plead with his friend or brother to join the ranks of God's people, actuated not by party motives, but from a sincere desire to confer a blessing on his friend. It is all very well to be zealous for your own Church or party, and many will from such motives, compass sea and land to make one proselyte, but in dealing with individual souls the great actuating motive should be an earnest desire for the good of their souls. It needs no elaborate arguments. They are often out of place and beyond the power of a simple-minded Christian to use, but if you are moved by an earnest and sincere desire, apart from all party considerations, to confer a blessing on your friend, it must by God's grace, have a happy effect on his heart and soul.

And now let us inquire what *success* Moses met with in thus pleading with his brother-in-law to remain. And here I must confess the issue, at first sight at least, appears to be discouraging, for what is the answer of Hobab? It is this—"I will not go, but I will depart to my own land, and to my kindred." He positively declines to accept the proposal to remain. But does Moses accept this as final? Far otherwise. He pleads still more earnestly with him, "Leave us not," he says, "I pray thee," and then urges him by a consideration of the double benefit at once to the people of God and to himself, "Forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes," "your intimate knowledge of the wilderness will be of use in guiding the Israel of God in circumstances of difficulty, and you will be a sharer with us of all God's goodness to His people." And what, we inquire again, was the effect of all this earnest pleading with his friend? We are not told; the subject closes here, but by looking at the after history of the children of Israel we have reason to believe that the pleadings of Moses succeeded, and that Hobab remained and cast in his lot with Israel. For if you turn to the Book of Judges you find it stated in chapter i. 16, that "the children of the Kenite, Moses' father-in-law, went up out of the city of palm trees with the children of Judah into the wilderness of Judah, which lieth in the south of Arad, and they went and dwelt among the people," clearly proving that in after times the descendants of Hobab are amongst the people of Judah, dwelling with, and partakers as Moses promised, of the goodness of the Lord to His people. What an encouragement is this to every Christian to plead, and plead on with loving and persevering earnestness with his friend, brother or sister, to come to Jesus and be blessed for ever!

And now with this subject before us, I would ask each of you, my friends, to inquire of your own soul, not am I journeying (for life is a journey from time to eternity), but am I journeying on the *road that leads to eternal life?* Have I by repentance passed the strait gate, and am I by faith walking along the narrow way that leadeth unto life? Or am I still travelling along "the broad road that leadeth to destruction?" You are journeying on one or the other. How solemn, how important the inquiry! You are either upon the up train that leadeth to the city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, or on the down train that leadeth through the tunnel of death to the land of darkness and death. May God direct you by His Spirit to Him who hath said, "I am the way, the

truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me."

But if, by God's grace, you are on the right road, then remember that journeying *means progress.* There is no such thing as standing still on the heavenly course. Here it is never said, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou moon in the valley of Ajalon," for the path of the just is as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Grow, then, in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, till through "brotherly kindness" you arrive at the climax of Christian graces, even "charity" or love to God and man, for "so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen."

THE Rev. John Gaselee, Rector of Little Yeldham, has just resigned his living.

THE London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* says :—"I hear of the formation of a London Diocesan Church Reading Union, under the presidency of the Bishop of the diocese, 'for the promotion of higher education in religious knowledge.' The General Council includes the two Suffragans and the two Deans within the diocese, with other dignitaries of the cathedral of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. Altogether the council comprises between fifty and sixty of the London clergy and laity, who have in some cases been asked to serve on account of their special knowledge of those peculiar kinds of learning which have recently made the archaic languages and literatures of Egypt and Mesopotamia ancillary to the Old Testament records. Local committees are formed for local purposes, and a course of study will be arranged and issued each year, and a list of books recommended for use. Courses of lectures upon the subject of the year's study, and upon kindred subjects, will be delivered at various centres, with examinations for those who offer themselves. Intermediate papers of questions will, I am told, be issued from time to time, and occasional papers will also be issued giving notes on the selected course of study."

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows :—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 30, 1890.

INSURANCE OF CHILDREN.

THE Bill which the Bishop of Peterborough has been trying to pass in the House of Lords, and which is now referred to a Select Committee, is causing a great deal of excitement in various circles, judging from the letters which constantly appear in the columns of the daily press. In one sense, it would seem as if the Bishop had been a little too severe in his remarks when moving the second reading; on the other hand, there have been cases and circumstances which have caused a good deal of scandal, and made men anxious that some such measure should be passed. There is, however, a *via media* between the two extremes which should be striven after.

At the outset, we may state that it is the bounden duty of parents to provide for their own households, and we could wish that the great desire of many working-men, to have their children's lives insured, so that, at death, they may secure a certain sum to recoup the outlay in bringing them up, and pay the funeral expenses, would show itself in a *thriftiness* in other matters. Look at the matter as we may, it is certain that the working classes in this country are *not* thrifty, and it would seem that all the experience of bad trade, and good trade, will never teach this lesson. Where right and proper measures are taken, we can see no harm in parents paying a penny a week for their children, if they like to do so; but we would venture to suggest that a list of the societies who insure children should be duly and properly certified to some competent authority. What is most to be deprecated is the insurance of illegitimate children in small clubs. We know of a number of cases where such children have been insured, and when death comes a burden is removed, and the sum for which the child is

insured is received, and very often spent in drink; we know for a fact that in one part of the country, after a funeral is over, the sexton is invited to the house, and regaled with drink, but, of course, the quantity that is dispensed depends on the amount received from the Burial Club.

Again, we object to the great number of small clubs which undertake to insure the lives of children. Burial Clubs in connection with Sunday Schools is a prominent feature; and we know of cases where membership of a Sunday School involves membership of a Burial Club, and that if a child leaves the school, to join any other, whether Church of England or Sectarian, the membership and the money are forfeited, and the managers are generally some small local men, whose books, we presume, are badly kept, and scarcely ever audited. Add to this fact that very often one of the managers is an undertaker, or carpenter, and so the club affords the double purpose of supplying a certain amount of trade, and of keeping up the number of children in the Sunday School. If the Bill could be passed in a modified form, so as to extinguish a great number of these clubs, it would be a very good thing. It may be argued that this would create a strong monopoly for certain societies, but the answer is quite clear, viz., that it is far better to have a certain number of properly-constructed clubs, or societies, with duly accredited, officers any of whom could be impeached in any case of misdoing, than to have a great number of bogus clubs and local societies of which the world in general knows nothing, and whose officers, if dishonest men, may decamp with the spoils of poor hard-working but confiding people. The same remark holds good in this matter as it does with regard to benefit clubs. We have known men who have paid into small clubs for many years past, but who, when the time of sickness and infirmity comes, find that all they have paid in has gone, the club is broken up, and they cannot be taken into the Oddfellows or Foresters' lodges on the score of advanced age. It is most important that men, when joining any benefit society, should join some well-known lodge, and it is the same with regard to Insurance Societies or Burial Clubs.

We are convinced that if these two important things are borne in mind, refusal to insure illegitimate children, and the extinction of small local and oftentimes bogus clubs, that much good may result. Panic legislation is always to be deprecated, a bill badly drafted, and with inaccurate statements and obscure clauses, may be found very awkward in time to come. What is wanted is thrift and carefulness among working people, the putting by for a rainy day, and if they like to insure their children's lives, so that when death comes there will be something to compensate the loss and meet the extra expenses, we do not see why any demur should be raised. There is only one thing, it might be advisable to put a limit to the age as to when a child shall be insured. We trust that the labours of the Select Committee will be successful, so that some satisfactory solution will be found for this great and important question.

HERE AND NOW? OR HEREAFTER?

A Bible Study by the Rev. RALPH W. HARDEN, B.A.

"The Lord is at hand."—Phil. iv. 5.

Who the Rev. John Gathercole may be, or where lies his parish, are questions that need not concern the readers of these papers. Enough to say that neither he nor his parishioner is an ideal character. There are, I venture to think, few faithful stewards of God's mysteries who are not appealed to constantly in their daily ministrations to interpret to some one or other of the flock committed to them, *what is this that the Lord saith?* How such questions are responded to is a matter for grave consideration in the present day. Assuming the intellectual equipment, the spiritual preparedness for the cautious handling (εὐλαβεια) of the Word of God in those who now fill the ranks of the Ministry, one is often perplexed to know how does a present-day curate, in the midst of all his multifarious duties, contrive to shut himself up alone with the Word of God.

The case supposed in what follows is no abstruse question of doctrine or prophecy, but touches a common place of Scripture that is concerned with the ordinary avocations of life.

A weary woman, at the close of her day of labour, betakes herself, as every Christian should, to solitary communion with her Lord. Her evening portion, St. Paul's words in the Epistle to the Philippians, chap. iv. 1-9, seems especially adapted to her needs. Deeply despondent she hears a call, "Rejoice in the Lord." Fretful and disappointed, "Let your moderation—your gentle forbearance—be known unto all men," comes in to restrain the rising anger against an unhelpful, or unsympathizing world. And in "The Lord is at hand" the Divine Presence—the God Incarnate, the Crucified, the Risen, the Ascended Jesus—makes itself felt, "a very present help in trouble." But her comfort is somewhat checked by the sight of the references in her Bible, and by the recollection of the position of these words, as the Epistle for the Sunday before Christmas Day. A doubt enters into her soul, not of God, neither of His love nor of His Word, but of the meaning that she ought to attach to that Word. Has she here a promise of the present and continued nearness of the Lord? or is it only a prophecy of His return to earth in the indefinite future?

Now this is her appeal to the pastor who has been set over her in the Lord, to minister in spiritual things. And it is one of those appeals that overwhelm every faithful Shepherd with the weight of his responsibility. The hireling may content himself with barely quoting the opinion of this Doctor or that Bishop, or the other Evangelist. The Shepherd feels he is himself called to "go in and out and find pasture" (John. x. 9) for his sheep in the whole domain of the Divine Revelation. And this is an arduous search. For it

he needs time, quiet, books, study, labour, patience, judgment—and all sanctified by prayer. Where and how are these to be gained in the midst of all the secular engagements that are crushing the best life out of the clergy of to-day? Whether Mr. Gathercole's conclusions be right or wrong is a matter of comparative indifference. The object of these papers will be achieved if they show how laboriously a faithful clergyman will strive in his ministry, that he may *rightly divide the word of truth* to those who follow him as their Pastor.

How our rector managed to redeem the opportunity it is needless to inquire ; what we want to know is the use he succeeded in making of it.

First of all, he opened his Greek Testament at Phil. iv. 5, and read the sentence, " The Lord is at hand," that is, *near*—(Greek ἐγγύς). What, he asked himself, would this mean in English? If any one said, *John is near*, would he not be understood to mean, John is here, beside me? Even if John had been absent on a journey and his return home expected, *John is near* would imply that John is *come*, that is, he is within sight, rather than, John is *coming*, meaning he will soon start for home.

However as he is now studying the Greek, not the English, the rector takes down his Grimm's *Lexicon of the Greek Testament*, and turns to the word ἐγγύς, near. There he finds the word described as an adverb, meaning *at hand, near*, used (1) of place and position; and (2) of time ; concerning things imminent and soon to come to pass. Examples are given of the different senses in which it is employed. But not satisfied with these, Mr. Gathercole determines to see for himself every occurrence of the word in the New Testament.

To do this, laying aside Grimm's *Lexicon*, he takes in its place the invaluable Concordance of the Greek New Testament by Bruder, where he finds every passage, without a single exception, in which the word occurs—*thirty* in all. Passing over those in which *near* is prefixed to another word, as *near, at the doors.* Matt. xxiv. 33 ; *near to Jerusalem*, Luke xix. 2, etc., he selects those only where the word is used as a simple predicate ; that is to say, where anything, whether place, or event, or person, is said to be near, or at hand, to what being omitted. These he sees are—*the summer*, Matt. xxiv. 32 ; Mark xiii. 28 ; Luke xxi. 30 ; *the time*, Matt. xxvi. 18 ; Rev. i. 3 ; xxii. 10 ; *the Kingdom of God*, Luke xxi. 31 ; *the passover*, John ii. 13 ; vi. 4 ; xi. 55 ; *the feast*, John vii. 2 ; *the place of the city*, John xix. 20, R. V., marg. ; *the sepulchre*, John xix. 42 ; *the Lord*, Phil. iv. 5.

Looking over all these, the minister of the Word does not feel inclined to make the distinction in the meaning of *near* laid down by Grimm—that, namely, of place and time. On the contrary he fancies that the idea underlying the word in all the passages, is this, that the *summer*, the *feast*, the *tomb*, the *Lord*, whatever in fact is spoken of, is close, adjacent to the persons speaking or addressed. That in some of the passages the temporal sense is found, seemed to him to be due to the idea of time in the subject spoken of, and not in any secondary meaning of the word ἐγγύς, *near*. When you say, The hour is near, you do not attach the idea of time to the word *hour*, because the word *near* has a temporal signification. You only mean that the idea of *closeness* which is in the word *near* must be used of time rather than place, because *hour*, a word of time, is the subject spoken of.

Therefore Mr. Gathercole asked himself : Is there, in the passage before me, in the closeness predicated of the Lord, more of place or of time in the word *The Lord?* And he concluded that though you would find the notion of time in the Lord's *Coming*, or the Lord's *Return*, or the Lord's *Kingdom ;* in the *Lord Himself* you can only realise the thought of His position—that is to say, *The Lord is near*, implying, there is no one between Himself and me ; He is by my side. When the Lord desired to inform His Church of His approaching return, He did not say, *I am near ;* He declared "The time is at hand" (καιρὸς ἐγγύς, Rev. i. 3 ; xxii. 10) ; or else, " I come quickly" (Rev. xxii. 20). And so, the Rector reasoned, because the Apostle has not said anything of the kind here, I am free to believe that *The Lord is near* points to the same presence which Christ Himself promised to His disciples, "I am with you always" (Matt. xxviii. 20), rather than to an approaching return in the undefined future.

So far this conclusion was based only upon a patient and impartial comparison of the expression as it occurs in the original language of the New Testament. With many indeed, teachers as well as taught, this would be amply sufficient to decide the question, and they would trouble themselves no farther. But not so Mr. Gathercole. This good pastor could never bring himself to believe that the Lord had raised up holy and able men from time to time in His Church, and endowed them with talents for learning, and with leisure to write, but never intended His disciples to reap the advantage of these excellent gifts, least of all in the study of the Word. He knew that the same difficulties which presented themselves to him must have long ago exercised the minds of men, whose vast learning and deep spiritual insight enabled them to judge and pronounce with an authority to which he could not pretend. And although, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, he was not called on to accept their decisions as infallible ; yet, as an earnest and reverent seeker after truth, and still more as a shepherd of souls, he did feel bound to examine their researches and respectfully weigh their reasons.

What George Herbert wrote of the country Parson might have been said of him :—

> " As he doth not so study others, as to neglect the grace of God in himself, and what the Holy Spirit teacheth him ; so doth he assure himself, that God in all ages hath had His servants, to whom He hath revealed His truth, as well as to him : and that as one country doth not bear all things, that there may be a commerce ; so neither hath God opened, or will open, all to one, that there may be a traffic in knowledge between the servants of God, for the planting both of love and humility. Wherefore he hath one comment, at least upon every book of Scripture ; and, plowing with this and his own meditations, he enters into the secrets of God treasured in the Holy Scripture."—(George Herbert, *The Country Parson*, ch. iv.)

Accordingly, the Rector first of all betook himself to the learned Commentary of Bishop Lightfoot, on the Philippians. Long ago his own soul had been wondrously strengthened by the depth of learning and keenness of argument in the Bishop's handling of the writings of the Fathers against the sceptical assault upon supernatural religion. And he thought that here, if anywhere, he would discover how this passage appeared to the mind of the early Church. Nor was he disappointed. On opening his Commentary at Phil. iv. 5, he sees that the Bishop notes the interpretation, to which his own study had already led him, as one "suggested by such passages as Ps. cxix. 151 ; cxliv. 18 (Comp. xxxiv. 18)," the same

thought which had occurred to the mind of his parishioner. And, in the same sense, the Bishop cites three passages from the writings of Clemens Romanus, Hermas, and Clemens Alexandrinus. This, therefore, satisfied Mr. Gathercole that the interpretation is neither new nor impossible.

Still, as he discovers, it is not one which Bishop Lightfoot accepts, for he adds, "This is neither so natural nor so appropriate here." The Rector has therefore to go back and examine the reasons of the Bishop's preference for the other interpretation. And this is what he reads :—

"*The Lord is at hand.* The nearness of the Lord's advent is assigned as a reason for patient forbearance. So similarly in St. James v. 8, 'Be ye also patient . . . . for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.' The expression *The Lord is at hand* is the Apostle's watchword. In 1 Cor. xvi. 22 an Aramaic equivalent is given, *Maran Atha*, whence we may infer that it was a familiar form of mutual recognition and warning in the early Church. Compare Barnabas, sec. 21, '*The day is at hand* (Greek ἐγγὺς) *in which all things shall be destroyed, together with the wicked one. The Lord is near* (Greek ἐγγὺς ὁ κύριος) *and his reward is with Him.*' See also Luke xxi. 31 ; 1 Pet. iv. 7."

Now, all his reverence for Bishop Lightfoot and his immense learning and scholarship did not prevent the Parson from going over carefully and critically this whole comment, sentence by sentence. He felt he was thus doing him more honour, as an intelligent disciple, than if he joined the servile crowd of copyists, who say their say, only because the Bishop of Durham, or some other prince in intellect or learning, has said it.

1. And first he took exception to the Bishop's statement, "The nearness *of the Lord's advent is* assigned." It is the nearness, he perceived, *of the Lord*, which St. Paul assigns. Whether it is His *advent* or not, is the question to be decided in an exegetical commentary.

2. Neither could Mr. Gathercole see that St. James v. 8 was a parallel reference. The *moderation*, i.e. *patient forbearance*, of St. Paul did not seem to him to be the same as the *patience* inculcated by St. James. The former uses a word indicating a righteous, godlike equity towards our fellow-men. St. James, on the contrary, is exhorting to a patient perseverance and a brave endurance of troubles, while waiting for *the coming of the Lord.* And this last, again, Mr. Gathercole noticed as markedly different in the two Epistles. For while St. Paul says "*The Lord* is near, using an adverb (ἐγγὺς); St. James affirms "*The coming of* the Lord draweth nigh, using a verb (ἤγγικε). So that in *three* very material respects he found the two supposed parallel passages to differ.

3. Again, the Rector was compelled to dissent from the assertion of the Bishop, that "*The Lord is at hand* is the Apostle's watchword." For, in the first place, the expression is never found anywhere in the New Testament but here. And secondly, the reference to *Maran Atha* in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, which the Bishop calls an "Aramaic equivalent," Mr. Gathercole thought might very reasonably be questioned, inasmuch as these words do not signify *The Lord is nigh*, but *The Lord is come ;* that is, according to Bishop Ellicott (*Comm. on 1 Cor.*), "with the future force of the tense in asseverations and assurances."

4. Lastly, the passage from St. Barnabas, quoted by Bishop Lightfoot, the Rector thought, was insufficient as a proof, because the nearness of the Lord as regards time is pointed out by the defining clause which precedes it, indicating the nearness of "the day in which all things shall be destroyed." And as for the New Testament quotations, that from St. Luke (xxi. 31) speaks of "the kingdom of God," and that from St. Peter (1, iv. 7) of "the end of all things," neither of them necessarily equivalent to the word of the text, which says *The Lord is near.*

His careful and deferential study of Bishop Lightfoot, therefore, confirmed the conclusion at which the Parson had arrived from his examination of the New Testament, with the aid of the Greek Lexicon and Concordance. It required stronger reasons to convince him than those which the Bishop had adduced in support of an interpretation which he evidently favoured. He turns, therefore, to another famous expositor, Bishop Ellicott. To him him more than to anyone, living or dead, the Parson owed whatever real knowledge of the Greek Testament he possessed; and, also, which was perhaps better, the conviction that there is no one thing for which the preacher, to apply the Bishop's words, "will have hereafter to answer before the dread tribunal of God with more terrible strictness than for having attempted to explain the everlasting Words of Life with haste and precipitation." (Ellicott, *Pref. to Comm. on Ep. to Galatians*, p. xiv.).

Like Lightfoot, Ellicott too, as Mr. Gathercole perceived, supports the interpretation which refers the Lord's nearness to His second coming, though at the same time indicating the other, and admitting a doubtfulness as to the "exact meaning and connection of the words" ; but preferring the Return, on account of the regular meaning of κύριος, *Lord*, in St. Paul's Epistles, and the demonstrable temporal meaning of ἐγγύς, *near.* (Matt. xxiv. 32 ; Rom. xiii. 11 ; Rev. i. 3.)

Now as the Rector was not quite clear how or why "the regular meaning of κύριος, *Lord*, in St. Paul's Epistles," should determine the phrase of His future coming, rather than of His continued presence, he opened the great exegetical commentary of Dr. Meyer, from which he knew that our English expositors were accustomed to draw largely; and here he reads : "The reference to *God*, by which Paul would bring home to their hearts, as Calvin expresses it, *diviæ providentiæ fiduciam* [a confidence in the divine providence], is not suggested in verses 1, 2, 4 by the context, which, on the contrary, does not refer to *God* until verse 6. Usually and rightly, following Chrysostom and Erasmus, the words have been attached to *what precedes*." So that Meyer also concludes that the phrase points to the nearness of Christ's Parousia. And for this reason—if the Rector had not misunderstood his words—Christ is departed from His people on earth ; therefore He cannot be with them and near them, to help and defend and comfort them, since this is God's work, not Christ's ; therefore, *The Lord is near* must be interpreted of Christ's return in the near future, rather than of His help in the present.

Now, whether *The Lord is at hand* is to be taken with what goes before or with what follows made no difference at all to Mr Gathercole. In neither case could he perceive the smallest reason for denying the possibility of the Lord Jesus being now present with and helping His people, as God, even though as man he believed Him to have ascended into heaven, and to be set down on the throne of God. "He is with His disciples"—so the Rector held with Stier ("Words of Jesus," vol. viii. p. 350), "for their strength, their defence, their assistance, their light, and their life—

in various ways, and by the medium of manifold instrumentalities; yet in all these, and everywhere, as the personal *I*." And what His divinity makes possible Christ's word made certain. The *Lo I am with you*, equally with *The Lord is near*, signifying Jesus is here, and not, Jesus is coming.

The other reason assigned by Bishop Ellicott for his preference of the future sense, namely, "The demonstrable temporal meaning of ἐγγύς, *near* (Matt. xxiv. 32; Rom. xiii. 11; Rev. i. 3)" could not be expected to weigh with the Rector, after the study he had bestowed on all the places of the New Testament where the word *near* is to be found. In the passages cited by the Bishop, as well as in many others, he had clearly noticed, as stated above, that the idea of time was not at all in the word *near*, but in the *summer*, or *season*, or *salvation*, each in itself an event conceived of as on the way, approaching to realization.

All things, therefore, considered patiently and prayerfully, after this study of what Lightfoot, Ellicott, Meyer, as well as Alford, had written on the subject, the Rector preferred the view of his parishioner, as he found it set forth by the learned Jean Daillé, a French Protestant Divine, in his valuable *Exposition of the Epistle to the Philippians*. On the words, *The Lord is at hand*, this writer observes:—

"This may have respect either to time or place. . . . . Nevertheless as the Prophet, in the 145th Psalm, from whence the Apostle seems to take this sentence, evidently speaks of the continual presence of God, saying, 'The Lord is nigh unto all that call upon him,' and as this consideration has a more exalted view, I prefer interpreting it rather with regard to place. For since this lovely and blessed Saviour is near to us, at our right hand, as the Psalmist sings, surrounding us on all sides, so that we cannot turn our eyes without beholding Him, knowing our necessities better than we ourselves can know them, and having both the will and the power to provide for them, what can occasion us anxiety, and why—men of little faith as we are—need we be worn with chagrin and useless care"?

There was, however, one point in these words of Daillé with which Mr. Gathercole could not agree: they connected *The Lord is at hand* with what follows, instead of with what precedes. Now, his honest and candid judgment quite went with Meyer in reading the passage as Chrysostom and Erasmus: "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." While, therefore, agreeing with Daillé in the meaning he assigned to *The Lord is at hand*, the Rector was compelled to dissent from his connecting the words with "Be careful for nothing." But though he did so, he felt that this acute and learned expositor had afforded the true means of solution, when he expressed himself convinced that the Apostle took his sentence from the Psalms. Both Meyer and Lightfoot, indeed, quote these passages, but only to reject the idea that they were intended for a citation of any of them by the Apostle. The Rector, therefore, resolved to institute a search in the *Apostles' Bible*.

If you want to know something of this book, "the most famous version of the Bible that the world has ever seen," as he calls it, I would ask you to read the Rev. J. Paterson Smyth's account of it, in his admirable volume, *The Old Documents and the New Bible* (pages 148 and ff). There you will learn, if you do not know it already, that the Bible chiefly used by our Lord and His Apostles was, not the *Hebrew* Old Testament itself, but the Greek translation called THE SEPTUAGINT. And this book Mr. Gathercole proceeded to consult, in order to see, first, where the Apostle's words, ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς, *the Lord is at hand*, occurred in it. And, for this purpose, he took down from his shelves a couple of dilapidated, battered-looking folios, some 170 years old, which he regarded as the pride of his little library, one of his most tried and trusty counsellors in the study of God's Holy Word. If you know ever so little Latin, and look over the Parson's shoulder at the title-page, you will see that this is a Concordance of the "Bible of the Seventy," made by a certain *Abraham Trommius*, and printed at Amsterdam in 1718.

This the Rector turns over, as you would *Cruden's Concordance*, till he finds the word ἐγγύς (*engus*, near) written by St. Paul to the Philippians, and which our translators have rendered, *at hand*. He sees in a moment that it occurs *thirty-nine* times in the Old Testament; and that in three places, and in three only, and all of them in the Psalms, it is joined with κύριος (*Kurios*, Lord) as in Philippians; namely, Ps. xxxiv. 18; cxix. 151; and cxlv. 18.

But, before proceeding to study these Psalms, he notices, what strikes him as somewhat remarkable, that, in seven places of the Old Testament, this word, *near*, is joined with *the day of the Lord*, in Isa. xiii. 6; Ezek. xxx. 3; Joel i. 15; ii. 1; Obad. 15; Zeph. i. 7; 14. And this—*The day of the Lord is near*, not *The Lord is near*—he remembers is the constantly recurring phrase of the New Testament. Rom. xiii. 12, "The day is at hand": 2 Thess. ii. 2, "The day of Christ is at hand" (ἐνέστηκεν): Heb. x. 25, "Ye see the day approaching": James v. 8, "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh": 2 Pet. iii. 10, "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night": 2 Pet. 12, marg., "Hasting the coming of the day of God": Rev. vi. 17, "The great day of His wrath is come."

This then, *The day of the Lord is near*, it struck Mr. Gathercole, was the watchword of St. Paul and the other New Testament writers, and not as stated by Bishop Lightfoot, *The Lord is near*. And if so, why should the Apostle, if he wanted the watchword, pass by the phrase well known to both Old and New Testament writers, and employ one which neither he nor any other sacred writer of the New Testament uses again, and which the Psalmist only takes in the present sense of readiness to help? Besides—and this the Rector considered a strong argument against the commentators—the Coming, that is the Parousia of Christ, as distinct from *the day of the Lord*, when pressed upon the notice of disciples, is not set before them by the Holy Spirit in the light of a day of vengeance upon the enemy on earth, as Meyer, Alford, and apparently, Ellicott put it, but as the day of hope and holy joy, the gathering out of the saints, quick and dead, from earth, "caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air" (1 Thess. iv. 17.) The train of thought unfolded by Lightfoot is therefore not relevant: "The end is nigh, when you will have to resign all. Bear with others now, that God may bear with you then." It is not congruous with that unalloyed assurance of salvation which the Apostle everywhere associates with the Parousia or Coming of the Lord.

And now having read through the xxxivth. Psalm, just as he finds it in the *Apostles' Bible*, Mr. Gathercole is struck by the style of the language. Unlike many another chapter of the Greek Old Testament, the whole of this Psalm seemed to him as easy and familiar as a chapter in the New. With perhaps only one exception, there was not a single word in the

whole that is not to be met with in the Greek Testament.

But, more remarkable still, he soon perceived that the leading words and expressions were those in which, most of all the New Testament writers, St. Paul and his companion, St. Luke, delight. Thus:

Of the three words of *praise* in the second and third verses, that for *make boast* is used only in the New Testament five times by St. Paul, and once by St. Luke; that for *be glad* fourteen times—three of them by St. Paul, eight by St. Luke, and three by St. John; and that for *magnify*, twice by St. Paul, five times by St. Luke, and once by St. Matthew.

Again, the word for *deliver*, verses 4, 7, 17, 19, is very Pauline. Out of nineteen places where it occurs in the New Testament, twelve of them are in the writings of St. Paul, and two in St. Luke's. The proportion is the same with the word used for *cry*, verse 18, only that St. Luke has it four times. And while *ashamed*, verse 5, is employed ten times by St. Paul, it is only used twice by St. Peter, once by St. Luke, and nowhere else in the New Testament. Out of forty-five New Testament passages where *troubles*, verses 6, 7, and 19 (rendered *affliction*) is met, twenty-three are in St. Paul and five in St. Luke. And the word for *pursue*, verse 14, is used eight times by St. Paul before *righteousness*, *hospitality*, *peace*, *love*, *mark*, *good;* and only twice, in Hebrews and 1 Peter, besides. St. Paul alone of the New Testament writers uses the phrase *fear of the Lord* (*God*, or *Christ*), verse 11, and that four times.

Trust, verses 8, 22, belongs to St. Paul in nineteen out of thirty-one places in the New Testament, and to St. Luke in five of them. And the particular phrase here, *to trust in* (ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ), which in the whole Greek Testament is only found once in John and twice in Peter, is used by St. Paul in four places for *having the hope set on a person or thing*. (See Rom. xv. 12; and 1 Tim. iv. 10; v. 5; vi. 17, R.V.)

But, most striking of all, is the use by St. Paul alone (if we except two places in Hebrews, one in Jude, and eleven in Revelation) of all the New Testament writers, of the word *Saints*, as the title of the Lord's people. Thirty-eight times he employs the word found here, verse 9. And in 2 Cor. ix. 12, it is joined to the word *want* as in the same verse.

All this made Mr. Gathercole incline to the belief that St. Paul had this Psalm so much in his mind, that he took from it the words *The Lord is at hand.* Daillé, however, had expressed his belief that the quotation was from Psalm cxlv. And it was quite possible that what he had just discovered, or thought he had discovered as to the Apostle's affection for Psalm xxxiv., might be equally true of the cxlv.th, or indeed of any other Psalm. However, on opening his *Apostles' Bible* again, he found that this was not likely. For, in the first place, though "The Lord is near" occurs at verse 18, there are, in the Psalm, but two of the very Pauline words which he found in Psalm xxxiv., namely, *make boast* and *cry*. Then again, there are but three other words which can be classed with these as Pauline. And, what is very striking, St. Paul's favourite word for saints, ἅγιοι, *hagioi*, found in Psalm xxxiv., does not occur in Psalm cxlv., but instead, another word, ὅσιοι, *hosioi*, verse 10, which St. Paul never uses as a title of Christ's disciples. And lastly instead of every word, as in Psalm xxxiv., being familiar to the reader of the Greek Testament, he found several not to be met there at all, and many of very rare occurrence. He felt therefore that it must be to Psalm xxxiv. and not to cxlv. that he must look for light.

He therefore turns back to study the design or scope of the Psalm. This he sees to be: 1. A call to rejoicing, based on the recollection of the Lord's mercies to the "poor man" that trusted in Him. "I will bless the Lord *at all times*." Nine times the word *Lord*, κύριος, occurs in this section. 2. There is an exhortation to the man "that desires life," to bridle the tongue, to turn from evil, to seek peace. 3. And lastly follows a comfortable assurance of the Lord's nearness and deliverance for such. His eyes observe them. His ear hearkens. He is near. He saves. He delivers. He keeps. He redeems.

But this is exactly the order of the Apostle's counsel: 1. "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice. 2. Let your moderation be known unto all men. 3. The Lord is at hand."

The Psalmist connects the presence of the Lord with the walk of the Saint. "Be thou wary, be silent rather, suffer somewhat, be patient, be gentle, be not easily provoked, be not revengeful—that thou destroy not noble peace, and God with His blessing depart from thee." (Jo. Arnd, in Hengstenberg, *On the Psalms*, xxxiv. 13, 18.) And this Old Testament comment is the most exact rendering of St. Paul's word, "Let your moderation be known unto all men" with its blessed concomitant, "The Lord is at hand." And this is the connection which all the commentators insist upon, and for which the Rector was looking.

Can we wonder, then, if he imagined that he discerned the presence of the Spirit inditing this holy epistle to the Church at Philippi; if he fancied he detected here the blending together of the human and divine? Before his mind's eye sat this "Chosen vessel" of the Lord, musing on the dissensions that were disturbing the peace of the church of his affections. And yet he had been privileged to call its members from darkness to light, to yearn over them as the Lord's *Saints*, whose names were "in the book of life." What message could he send to still the strife of tongues, to allay the thirst for self, to terminate the guile and wrong-doing that were all affrighting peace? And then the hand of the Lord was upon him, bringing to him now no new psalm nor doctrine, nor interpretation; only reviving and strengthening within his soul the memory of other words of inspiration, the old and dearly-cherished song of the devout Psalmist of Israel. Under that divine Teacher, David too had sung of one who desired life and longed to see good days, in a sense that stretched beyond the bounds of time. He, too, had felt, and known, and witnessed against the power of an evil tongue, an unholy walk, to banish the peace and the presence of the Lord. And so within the Saint of the newer age, beneath the brooding presence of the Holy Spirit of God, there grew into shape and fashion this divine epitome of the old inspired psalm, to be the Church's blessed dower; replete with a fulness of light and love, which the Psalmist had only begun to taste. He sang of the Lord unseen, but not yet come. The more favoured Apostle had himself seen the Just One, and heard His voice (Acts xxii. 14), that he might witness of the nearness of that same ascended Lord, near, though unseen; here, though departed; though gone, yet present, until His glorious return. "I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

And thus, the Pastor found he had a message for his flock, while he thought himself working but for one solitary sheep. The theme—the nearness of Christ;

on the right hand and on the left, regarding, relieving, restoring; the bearing of this presence, so awful—"Beware of Him, and obey His voice; provoke Him not"—and yet so loving, upon the walk and conversation. The life that grows beneath this genial light—the love that "seeketh not her own"; the energy that labours nothing through strife nor vain-glory; the lowliness that esteems other better than ourselves; the self-abnegation that looks not on our own but on the things of others (Phil. ii. 3, 4); the holy joy, the source and flow of all the strength of this life divine (Neh. viii. 10), welling up perennially in new and ever-widening channels of blessing for the thirsty world around—all came in upon the Pastor's soul with a force and fulness of blessing such as the words had never brought before. And in his heart of hearts he thanked the Lord who had made his humble parishioner the minister—to himself her minister, of so much peace and consolation in the Word.

Reviews and Notices.

"CASSIOPE AND OTHER POEMS." By Boleyne Reeves. London: Kegan, Paul & Co.

WE find in this little volume several pieces which have appeared from time to time in the PULPIT, with the familiar subscription, "J. J. M."; so we take leave to regard the author's name as a *nom de plume*. The lament of "Cassiope" for a man whom the world, while it does *not* delight to honour, yet marks him well as one "who'll be famous by and by," is turned into rejoicing, when his merits are recognised, only alas! in time for death to claim him. The story of "Rahel Levin" strikes one as fanciful, since a trance could hardly last for thirty years (with all due deference to "Rip Van Winkle"), and if she were *dead*, it could not have been as many days before "dust to dust they sing." The book is full of sad subjects. such as "The Suicide," "The Infanticide," "The Flown Dove," and so on, relieved here and there by pieces with a moral, some being well worded in a flowing pleasant style, such as "The Choice," "The Organist, a record of Puritan Persecution," and the "Glove Maiden." "To A. J." is spoilt, as are one or two others, by the introduction of French words; and the writer occasionally takes liberties with his rhythm. "Bell" is really very amusing, and "Babe Wisdom" will touch the heart of those who rejoice in their first "Cherubic child."

"AN APPEAL TO UNITARIANS." By a Convert from Unitarianism. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1890. Pp. 91, price 3s.

IT is distinctly stated, both on the title page and in the body of this book, that it is a personal history. Were it not so said, we should be disposed to regard it as a controversial discourse, put into a peculiar form, with a licence which is considered legitimate in literary affairs. Even in such case, the work is entitled to very high commendation; but as it is, we doubt not, real and genuine, it is one of the most remarkable books among those that have come under our notice for a considerable time. The author is evidently more of a thinker than of a scholar; this we do not say in dispraise. We are not about to give a synopsis of the work; there is nothing new or original in its leading idea, while in its treatment of spiritual and doctrinal religion there are many remarks which have every appearance of originality. Indirectly, the author has been, in our belief, much indebted to Coleridge and Maurice; we say indirectly, for it is most unlikely that one so candid and conscientious should not acknowledge indebtedness, did he know from what sources he derives his philosophy—we had almost said, his system. We suppose that the Unitarian clergy to whom he looked up in his youth, were not ignorant of Maurice at least. It may be interesting to readers of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT, that our author's brief but comprehensive observations on the Athanasian Creed almost exactly coincide with the view contained in some papers published herein last year. If any doubt could linger in our mind as to the genuineness of this book, it would be removed by one casual remark, to the effect that the author's old Unitarian friends have always been quite indifferent, and even perfectly incurious, about his change of religious opinion and attachments. This is so like what we know of persons of that way of thinking, whether sincere or unthinking, amiable or self-sufficient, that its appositeness gives convincing evidence of perfect *bona fides*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ATTEMPTS TO CLEAR THE ATMOSPHERE.—SECOND PART.

SIR,—In a letter I wrote to the PULPIT, which appeared on 26th July, I expressed the belief that the Augustinian theology was not freely adopted by the majority of pious and intelligent men in the early Church. I brought forward the account given by Milman in "Latin Christianity" to show that Augustin and the African bishops invoked the Civil Power to suppress by penalties the religious opinions which they deemed erroneous. Augustin at that time went so far as to declare that "the Christian Powers are bound to use *disciplinam coercitionis* against all opponents of the Catholic faith." That was the germ of persecution by Christians, of which it may be truly said that Augustin was one of the chief originators. Lecky gives a decided opinion on that point in his "Rationalism." He says, "The writer, who was destined to consolidate the whole system of persecution, to furnish the arguments of all its later defenders, was unquestionably Augustin, on whom, more than on any other theologian, more, perhaps, even than Dominic and Innocent, rests the responsibility of this fearful curse."

It seems clear to my mind that the earliest Christian writers expressed their opinions with much freedom. I am gratified in finding good grounds to believe that the majority were in favour of Universalism. The author of "Primitive Universalism," after giving copious extracts from the early fathers, says: "In that famous age of the Church's story, the period embracing the fourth and the earlier years of the fifth century, Universalism seems to have been the Creed of the majority of Christians in East and West alike." Henry Ward Beecher, a famous American divine, who died a few years since, said in 1878: "It has

been shown that during the first four hundred years of the Christian era, the three theories of restoration, of annihilation of the wicked, and of the eternal punishment of the wicked, were held indifferently, and no man's orthodoxy was called in question on that ground. . . . Four of the first six schools of theology taught the final restoration of mankind."

It is interesting, though sad, to trace the gradual suppression of freedom, and the dreary centuries of darkness and cruelty which succeeded. In referring to the "History of the Christian Religion and Church," by Neander, I find, in Vol. III., Section II., that Augustin was at first opposed to the use of force or penal measures against heretics. Neander makes the following remarks: "When at the Council of the North African Church, held at Carthage, A.D. 404, the question was agitated about requiring the Emperor to pass new penal laws against the Donatists. . . . Augustin, with several of the younger bishops, declared against it. He said men must go forward simply with the word of truth, must seek to conquer by arguments, unless, instead of open and avowed heretics, they would have hypocritical Catholic Christians." In opposing the Donatists, and striving against their tenets, Augustin gradually adopted the idea that persecution is a duty, and advocated a theory of ecclesiastical rights, of which he was previously the opponent. The following observations by Neander seem to me very judicious and instructive: "True, Augustin continually explains that everything must flow from the temper of love; but of what use was this principle in a theory which gave full sway to arbitrary will? . . . It was by Augustin, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which, tempered though it was in its practical application by his own pious, philanthropic spirit, nevertheless contained the germ of the whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition."

J. B.

Canonbury, 19th August, 1890.

CANON SMITH ON THE OLD TESTAMENT AND OUR LORD'S AUTHORITY.

SIR,—Not having read Canon Smith's paper in this month's *Expositor*, but only the review of it which appears in your issue of the 9th inst., these remarks must be taken merely for what they are worth. No one doubts what St. Luke says, "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature," etc. But does not this only refer to the time from His childhood to His baptism? At His baptism, the unmeasured outpouring of the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit endued Him with divine powers of knowledge, etc. Why may we not believe that He, who, while He was on earth, was omnipotent in the natural world, was also omniscient in the intellectual world? Why try and limit His powers in some respects, which were limitless in others? Why say that no show of knowledge of astronomy, geology, etc., on His part more than others proved He possessed none other than they? How does that affect the matter, for I deny it proves the impossiblity of His possessing more? Must we without question conclude, that it is unreasonable to suppose that our Lord was endowed with knowledge useless (as we may imagine) for His blessed work, or that in assuming our nature He also took the limits of natural knowledge belonging to that condition? If our Lord knew infallibly the most hidden thoughts of man's heart, how can we doubt His power of acquiring knowledge on every subject, if He willed it; which knowledge is generally derived from study and observation? Our Lord was perfect God and perfect man; but are the attributes of His divinity, of which surely omniscience is one, to be considered as limited while He was on earth by the bounds of ordinary humanity?

INQUIRENS.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

SIR,—The writer of the article on the above subject in the PULPIT of the 23rd inst. says that, "our Heavenly Father has made truth difficult of attainment." If by "truth" he means spiritual truth, as I suppose he does, then it is not easy to see how any one, with the Bible in his hands, could say that it is "difficult of attainment." Our Saviour says "Thy word is truth;" and "when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth." St. John says, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things;" and St. James says, "if any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." Consequently, if men possess not this truth the fault is entirely their own; they have not sought it properly; they have not asked aright for it.

It is truly marvellous how little some Churchmen seem to know of the teaching of their own Church on this important matter. Beautifully does she say, "God, who as at this time didst teach the hearts of Thy faithful people, by the sending to them the light of Thy Holy Spirit; grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things." "A right judgment in all things." What more do we want? And how plainly and simply the way is pointed out in which we can obtain that right judgment.

R. DONALDSON.

August 25th, 1890.

NEWMAN ON THE POPE'S PERSONAL INFALLIBILITY.

SIR,—I send you a cutting from the *Freeman's Journal*, the Priests' organ in Dublin, date August 21st.

"Amongst the letters of the late Cardinal Newman, one has just been shown to me written in excellent French to the Archbishop of Paris, who took the unopportunist side in the Vatican Council. The Oratorian and future Cardinal, probably in reply to some letter of the Archbishop, which may be published hereafter, says—'The doctrine of Infallibility has now been more than sufficiently promulgated. Personally I have never had a shadow of doubt that the very essence of religion is protection from error, for a revelation which could stultify itself would be no revelation at all. I have always inclined to the notion that a general council was the magisterial exponent of the creed just as the judges of England are the legal expounders of the statutes of our realm. Unfortunately a general council may be hampered and hindered by the action of infidel Governments upon a weak or time-serving Episcopate. It is therefore better that the individual command of Christ to

Peter to teach the nations and to guard the Christian structure of society should be committed to His undoubted successor. By this means there will be no more of those misunderstandings out of which Jansenism and Gallicanism have arisen.'"

I will only make two remarks—1st. He makes an infallible expounder of Scripture necessary; else, he says, "it would be no revelation at all." Well, the Jewish Church was the expositor; and it declared our Lord an impostor. 2nd. He would have preferred that infallibility should reside in a general council, but he feared the influence of infidel Governments upon a weak, time-serving Episcopate. Therefore, expediency made him adopt the personal infallibility of the Pope. So it was a matter of policy.

C. C., V.-G.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bindley, Rev. Thomas Herbert, M.A., Vice-Principal of Codrington College, Barbadoes; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Barbadoes and Windward Islands.
Bowring, Rev. Edgar Francis, M.A., Rector of Farncombe.
Dixon, Rev. John William, Curate of St. Brides's, Manchester; C.M.S. Association Secretary for Herefordshire, Monmouthshire, and Wales.
Fleming, Rev. Sydney Hall, Vicar of Harwood, near Bolton; Vicar of Boxted, Colchester.
Harper, Rev. Henry Barnett, B.A., Chaplain R.N., to Haslar Hospital.
Hay, Rev. Maynard Whitworth, Rector of Rockingham.
Hill, Rev. Thomas Ernest, Principal of the Theological College at Gloucester.
Horne, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Thundridge, Ware; Vicar of Christ Church, St. Albans.
Hutt, Rev. Richard Goode, Rector of Helland.
Jones, Rev. Thomas Jesse, M.A., Rector of Gelligaer.
Lane, Rev. Frederick Holding, Vicar of North Rode, near Congleton.
Leach, Rev. Alfred Wynter, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Shamley-green.
Leney, Rev. La Grange, M.A., Vicar of Hinckley.
Lowndes, Rev. Ernest Campbell, M.A., Minor Canor of Chester Cathedral; Vicar of St. Oswald's, Chester.
Mathias, Rev. James Charles Stewart, Rector of Cossington.
Morris, Rev. George Edward Ciifton, Vicar of Horninghold.
Mulholland, Rev. Thomas Cromwell, Vicar of St. James's, Stockton-on-Tees; Vicar of Christ Church, Gateshead.
Ottley, Rev. Robert Lawrence, M.A., Dean of Magdalen College, Oxford.
Reeves, Rev. John Fry, Rector of Tregony-cum-Cuby.
Rhodes, Rev. Joseph, B.A., Chaplain to Lord de Tabley at Tabley Park; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Strong, Rev. Thomas George, Curate of St. Silas's, Bristol; Vicar of Willington, Burton-on-Trent.
Swire, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Peasemore, Newbury; Priest-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty.
Watts, Rev. William Longmore, Vicar of Boxted, Colchester; Vicar of Harwood, near Bolton.
Weston, Rev. Frank Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Birmingham.
Wheeler, Rev. Walter Compton, B.A., Vicar of Wolford.
White, Rev. Frederick G. H. H. E., Chaplain R.N., to the *Northumberland.*
Whitehead, Rev. Thomas Henry, Rector of Donnington, Herefordshire.
Wilton, Rev. Alexander Stuart, B.A., Perpetual Curate of East Hardwick, York.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Green, Rev. William, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, at Winterton Rectory, Norfolk, on the 17th inst., aged 68.
Holland, Rev. Charles Dudding, Rector of Fishtolt, on the 17th inst., aged 74.
Wilkinson, Rev. G. P., at Harperley Park, County Durham, on the 21st inst., aged 67.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

HIS PEOPLE AND HIS SORROW.

By the Rev. HENRY BRASS, M.A., F.G.S., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Red Hill.

A Sermon Preached in Christ Church, Jerusalem, on Sunday Morning, March 24th, 1889.

"And when He was come near, He beheld the city and wept over it."—Luke xix. 41.

IT was the hour of Christ's greatest earthly triumph! "In lowly pomp" He was riding towards Jerusalem, escorted by an admiring, applauding multitude, waving their branches of palm, casting their garments beneath His feet, and filling the air with shouts—"Hosanna to the Son of David," "Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord," "Hosanna in the highest!" And now the brow of the Mount of Olives is turned, and there bursts upon His view a sight which, once seen, is never forgotten—Jerusalem, "beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth," with its magnificent Temple, and gilded domes and palaces, girt about with the walls and towers of Zion, like a gem in an emerald-setting of palms and olive-trees.

The sight redoubles the rapturous shouts of the multitude; and fresh enthusiasm is kindled in His disciples' breasts at the thought that *now* Jerusalem will welcome her Messiah and her King. Surely, it is the hour of the Redeemer's triumph! And they turn to catch the smile of joy and holy pleasure which should light up that wonderful face.

No! He weeps! But why does He weep?

His own words suggest the reason, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes."

Ah, He knew too well the stubborn hardness of that "stiff-necked people." He knew that the loud "Hosannas" of the multitude would soon be exchanged for hoarse cries of "Away with Him! Crucify Him!" He knew that in rejecting Him they were rejecting salvation, and He shuddered to think of their awful crime, and the doom which would be pronounced on those who should appear at the judgment seat in garments stained with the blood of their murdered King. "He beheld the city"—not as now bathed in light and splendour, but "hemmed in on every side" by exasperated foes while famine and pestilence, strife and murder, and maddening infatuation reigned within, the streets resounding with groans of the dying, and choked up with bodies of the slain, horrors enacted which should make the tongue cleave to the roof of the mouth; and then Temple and City all wrapped in one red winding sheet of flame, and the Roman plough burying the guilty ashes in the silent earth!

"And when He beheld the city He wept over it." He might indeed, in righteous anger, have spoken words of judgment for the horrible treatment He was receiving at their hands, "Proud city, that hast wilfully rejected thy King, and crucified the Son of God, and heaped vile insults on the holiest, best that ever trod thy streets—perish in thine unbelief. Fill up the measure of thine iniquity; thy terrible overthrow shall vindicate Me and the truth of My doctrine"!

But no! it was with totally different feelings that Jesus "beheld the city."

Nought but Divine compassion beamed in that tearful eye, and words of deep pity and sorrowful love came from that breaking heart. As if unmindful of all the cruel wrongs He was about to suffer at their hands, His own soul seemed occupied with overwhelming sorrow for their sin, and the misery they were bringing on themselves.

And, my brethren, what do *we* not owe to the compassion of the Saviour? Had it not been for that, He had never stooped from heaven to earth, nor shed His "precious blood" to save such guilty, ungrateful rebels, and we had been lost for ever!

But, thank God, His compassion now is still the same as when He wept over Jerusalem.

Sinner! He weepeth over thee. And as He sees thee wandering from thy God, breaking thy Baptismal vows, unmindful of a thousand mercies, ungratefully neglecting a Saviour's love, grieving the Holy Spirit, thoughtlessly or recklessly sinning away thy day of grace—as He beholds thy headstrong folly, He weepeth over thee, "Oh, if thou hadst known the things that belong to thy peace"!

And thou, too, Christian, who hast known and felt something of thy Master's compassion—what wouldest thou do if He were not compassionate still?

Whither wouldest thou flee in trouble, sorrow, and temptation, if thou hadst not a "merciful High Priest," "touched with a feeling of our infirmities"? How would thy unworthy prayers be accepted, thy sins forgiven, thy backslidings healed, were it not that He who wept over Jerusalem is still thy merciful Intercessor, and "hath compassion on the ignorant" and erring?

And if, my brethren, Christ's feelings have not changed to us Gentiles, think you for a moment they have towards Jerusalem? and that his own chosen people Israel, "the seed of Abraham," which "He took upon Him"—that they alone are out of the pale of His compassion? "I say then, Hath God cast away His people? God forbid"!

No, "the gifts and calling of God are without

repentance." Depend upon it, He who once wept and pleaded, "Father forgive them," did not plead in vain. He has Himself declared in the prophetic page, "For Zion's sake I will not hold My peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth." Hear God's yearnings over that prodigal child Israel —"Is Ephraim My dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still: therefore My bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord." (Is. lxii. 1; Jer. xxxi. 20.)

And as He now beholds the city where His feet once loved to walk, and where He so freely poured forth His precious blood—desolate, forsaken, "trodden down of the Gentiles"—her people scattered among the nations, "a hissing, a by-word, and a proverb," miserable in their wanderings, outcasts from His Church, ignorant of their own Messiah, still not "knowing the things which belong to their peace"—oh, can we for a moment doubt that if tears are ever seen on the face of the glorified Saviour, it is when He looks upon the miserable state of His own "kinsmen according to the flesh," and that even now the scene on Mount Olivet is being enacted afresh—"And when He beheld the city He wept over it"?

In plain words—Has not the Lord Jesus the same compassion now for the national and spiritual condition of the Jews?

And, my brethren, we want you, as professing Christians, to follow Christ in this respect. "Let the same mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus." If it is not so, *must there not be something wrong in your Christianity?*

Oh, if we have only felt—Christ has had too much cause for compassion in my case: Christ has wept over my sinful soul! something of that Divine compassion will surely go forth to others.

Let it, then, freely flow forth to every object of pity at home and abroad, to every one who knows not the blessedness of Christ's full salvation, and especially to the ignorant, the outcast, the fallen; to those who can say with truth, "No man careth for my soul."

To-day we would especially draw forth your compassion towards "the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

And is there not enough to draw it forth?

Behold "the city which men called 'the perfection of beauty,'" a desolation, trodden down by the feet of the Moslem—the land of the Bible bound up with our earliest and most hallowed associations —her rightful owners outcasts and wanderers among the nations!

Are the miserable, the unfortunate, objects of compassion? Who has drunk so deeply of the bitter cup of suffering and misery as that once happy, flourishing people, for 1800 years "a hissing a by-word, and a proverb" among the nations, and even lately bitterly persecuted and oppressed in Russia and Roumania?

Does fallen greatness excite our pity? Behold the "aristocracy of the earth"—descendants of a noble line of warriors and judges, prophets and kings!

Are we wont to compassionate the children of our greatest benefactors? Their fathers once brought to us the best of blessings. But for the zeal and love of Paul and other Jewish missionaries, we, in England, might have been idolaters still!

Nay, Christian brethren, has *Christ* done anything for you? Do you owe anything to Him? Remember that Jesus Himself was a Jew! And when you behold the deplorable spiritual state of His "brethren according to the flesh," will you "shut up your bowels of compassion" and refuse to help them? Will you risk incurring the solemn rebuke, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these My brethren, ye did it not to Me"?

Oh, it is passing strange, 'tis marvellous, the indifference of Christians generally towards the Jews!

How are we to account for it? Is it from a deep-rooted prejudice against the modern Jewish character? Well, have not we Gentiles helped to make it what it is by persecution in times past, and contempt and neglect now?

Or, is it from a lurking doubt that the Jew's case is a hopeless one, and his "wound incurable"?

Look again at those tears that Jesus shed. Were they tears of utter despair? Did they banish all hope?

Listen to His own words. Even when He pours forth His last sorrowful complaint, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! .... Behold your house is left unto you desolate"—He even then holds out no uncertain hope that they shall see Him again, and say, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."* Look at His own actions. No sooner is He risen from the dead than He sends forth missionaries to convert them, and gives commandment "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem.*" †

Or, look at the practice of those whom He instructed and sent forth; how did they interpret His tears? They always preached Christ first to the Jews; and, so far from considering their case hopeless, St. Paul declares that "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to the *Jew first*"!

I open the New Testament, and I read an Epistle addressed to the Hebrews, proving from their own Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ. I read an Epistle to a Gentile Church, and I find the Romans rebuked for their contempt of the Jews, and their ingratitude to those through whom they received the Gospel.‡

* St. Matthew xxiii. 37-39. † St. Luke xxiv. 47.
‡ Romans xi. 17-25.

I find the same Apostle explaining the fall of the Jewish nation, not as final and irrevocable, but only as a temporary fall; that they shall be received back again into God's favour and the Church's communion, and that "all Israel shall be saved."* I turn to the prophecies of the Old Testament, and I find in almost every page that "glorious things are spoken" of Zion and Zion's people. I find glowing predictions of Israel's future conversion and prosperity expressed in every conceivable variety of illustration and figure—I find such a weight of evidence, that I defy the most ingenious special pleader to set it aside; then I turn to the New Testament, and I find Christ's own Apostles stamping these prophecies with the seal of inspiration, and in plain unfigurative language confirming this our interpretation of them—and I cannot doubt the fact that, sooner or later, Christian efforts to convert the Jews will be *crowned with splendid success;* and I feel that I dare not evade my bounden duty as a Christian to do something for Christ's "brethren according to the flesh," and that in so doing I am not only best complying with the teaching and practice of His Apostles, but rightly interpreting the tears of compassion He shed over Jerusalem, followed up as they were by the command to preach the Gospel to the Jew!

"Let the same mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus." But, brethren, do not allow that compassion to evaporate in mere sentiment or excited feeling, but carry it out practically.

Help this Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, which has been patiently and faithfully labouring for years in this good cause, through much opposition and reproach.

Do not let any one excuse himself from his duty by saying that he looks for more remarkable results than have been hitherto produced. People make a great mistake if they expect that you have only to put the statements of Christ before the Jew for him to at once accept them, and they are disappointed if a pentecostal blessing does not follow!

Ah, do they not show themselves sadly ignorant of human nature? Dealing with the Jew is not like dealing with the heathen. Bitter prejudices, deep-seated unbelief, separate his case from every other. We have to undo the work of eighteen centuries of oppression, insult, scorn, and bigotry, connected, alas, with the name of "Christian."

What we have sown, that we must expect to reap; and the Christian Church has a right to expect trouble, and hard up-hill work in undoing the mischief its neglect and inconsistency have caused! It is indeed "a work of faith and labour of love."

But yet, thank God, there are great and remarkable results, if we consider the limited Missionary Agency which has been employed.

* Romans xi. 11, 15, 23, 24, 26.

The well-known Dr. Adolph Saphir, himself of the house of Israel, says, "There is no Mission in the world which, in proportion to the number of the people, has produced greater results than the Mission to the Jews."

When this Society commenced its work, there were not 50 Christian Israelites known in the United Kingdom; there are now more than 3,000, and about 150 have been ordained as clergymen of the Church of England. In Germany it is said that there is hardly a town where there are not some believers in the Lord Jesus; and this is the result of our Missions, directly or indirectly.

In the Society's Chapel in Palestine Place, London, you will find in the Baptismal registers the names of 1,673 of the house of Israel. Dr. Stern left 800 Converts in Abyssinia as the result of his Mission, and the work is still going on, though the European Missionaries have long been banished from the country, and no less than thirty families of converts have lately suffered martyrdom rather than give up Christ for Mahomet. But no true estimate of the Society's work can be formed from the number of Baptisms to be found in the Annual Reports. Many, who have been brought to Christ by the teaching of the missionaries, go elsewhere to be baptised. I have myself witnessed baptisms of Jews, in other parts of England, who had been first influenced by the agents of this Society. One impressed by the Missionary at Bagdad was baptised by Dr. Stern in the prison in Abyssinia—another turned up in distant Hong Kong!

People generally have little idea of the large number of Jews who are either secretly or openly adopting the Christian faith. In Vienna alone, according to a Jewish newspaper, 263 such cases took place in one year, including 13 Doctors of Law, 9 of Medicine, 1 Dentist, 4 Editors, 3 Civil Engineers, 3 University Professors and 11 Students, 3 Judges, 2 High Army Officers, 1 Banker and his wife, 17 Merchants and Manufacturers, etc.

There has been a great change in the attitude of Jews towards the missionaries and towards Christianity. Jesus Christ is now often spoken of as a great Reformer, and a good Moral Teacher, whom it was a mistake to have put to death. Jews will now openly come, and in great numbers, to special Sermons preached in London and our large towns. Compare the Reports of the last few years with those of thirty or forty years ago, and you will be suprised at the progress made.

I myself could give instances, were it prudent to do so, of a great change of feeling towards Christian teachers on the part of Jewish Rabbis.

As an illustration of this change of feeling, and the interesting work at Safed, see the Report for 1887, pp. 121-2.

Joseph Rabbinowitch has formed in South Russia a Hebrew-Christian Community, which promises to attract many. He received his firs[t]

New Testament through a Missionary of this Society, and he has drawn up a Communion Service, evidently based on that of our own Prayer Book.

But time would fail me were I to attempt to speak of all the interesting work going on amongst the Jews.

Go into this City. Visit the Schools, catechise the children, as I have done, and see how admirably they have been instructed in the Christian faith. Take an interest in the House of Industry, the Inquirers' Home, or the Institution for Jewesses. Or find your way through the narrow streets to the Hospital, and see how Christian kindness is undermining Jewish prejudice, and how disposed they are to listen to Christian teaching. Surely, it has not been in vain that since 1860, 15,561 In-Patients, and 219,373 Out-Patients have been treated in the Hospital, and thus practically taught what Christian love is.

And we feel persuaded that the large number of Old and New Testaments, Liturgies, Controversial Tracts, and other Publications are doing their work amongst the nation, and that the seed thus long and patiently sown will soon bear an abundant harvest.

But though we thank God for what has been done, we must not forget how much more remains to be done, and that there are millions of Jews, chiefly in Russia, Central Asia, China, and Arabia, as yet unreached.

In conclusion, we would have you take a just and Scriptural view of what we hope to accomplish by our Missions; not the conversion of the whole nation, but preparing the way for that conversion.

Our work is to gather in "the remnant according to the election of grace,"—to remove prejudice, to awaken inquiry, to teach and preach Jesus Christ, to "prepare the way" for the Lord Himself.

God works by means, and unless we use the means, we are hindering instead of hastening the coming of the Lord; and while we do our part in faith and patience, we wait for the fulfilment of that sure word of prophecy, "I will pour upon the house of David, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son;"* "And so all Israel shall be saved,"† "and a nation be born at once."‡

Oh, *then* shall the Redeemer "see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied"; and when He beholds the once impenitent city prostrate in deep contrition, and welcoming their long-rejected Messiah with shouts of "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord"!—no tears shall then bedew the cheek of the Son of Man, but a smile of holy joy and triumph, even as it is written, "The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty; He will save, He will rejoice over thee with joy; He will joy over thee with singing."*

And then shall not all those who, out of love to Christ, have helped to prepare His way, share in the Redeemer's joy? For the old prophecy concerning Israel is not yet exhausted—"Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee."†

* Zechariah xii. 10. † Romans xi. 26. ‡ Isaiah lxvi. 8.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that the Rev. H. D. Cust Nunn, vicar of Sharow, has been appointed to succeed Mr. H. L. Butcher as secretary of the Ripon Diocesan Society.

IT is authoritatively announced by the Rev. Cecil Deedes, Hon. Sec. of the Zululand Mission, that the vacant bishopric of Zululand was offered to Archdeacon Gibson, of Kaffraria, but, acting under medical advice, he has declined the offer.

THE order of proceedings for the Bath and Wells Diocesan Conference has been issued. The sittings, as already announced, will take place at Wells on October 7th, at Bath on the 8th, and at Taunton on the 9th, and on each day there will be a celebration of the Holy Communion.

ON Monday week the Rev. W. Hutchinson, Prebendary of Lichfield, completed his twenty-fifth year as Vicar of Blurton, Staffordshire, and attained his eightieth birthday. In honour of this a garden party was given by Mrs. Ford, of Blurton House, to all the adult parishioners and members of the congregation. After tea, Mr. W. Davenport, as one of the oldest parishioners, presented to Mr. Hutchinson, in the name of the parish and congregation, a barometer with a suitable inscription.

CARDINAL MANNING has addressed the following characteristic letter to the Hon. Secretary of the Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association:—"The object of the Burial Reform Association seems to me to be very reasonable and wholesome. The excesses of costliness rarely come under my notice, by reason of the poverty of my people; but from the published descriptions they would appear to be both burdensome and unmeaning. It would be better if the needless outlay of money were given in some form of benefit to the poor."

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

* Zephaniah iii. 17. † Numbers xxiv. 9.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1890.

AFRICA.—THE BULLET AND THE BIBLE.

WHAT is the real truth about successful African exploration and civilization hitherto? Has real progress been secured by that combination of "bullet and Bible," which is the new German Chancellor's version of the old Chancellor's motto of "blood and iron?"

The earliest and most illustrious of African explorers were Mungo Park, Bruce, Denham and Clapperton, and such-like men, who, for the most part, were distinguished by their peaceable and conciliatory conduct as travellers. Indeed, common sense led them to act in such a manner, otherwise their lives would not have been safe for a day. And as missionaries and pioneers of African civilization, who have ever surpassed, or even equalled, the illustrious Moffatt and Livingstone? But these were eminently pacific and Quaker-like in their whole procedure, even amongst the wildest savages. For instance, there was the fierce chief Africaner, who had been the terror of South Africa for many years, but who, at length, under the peaceful influences of the Gospel of Christ, as preached and practised by Mr. Moffatt, became changed from the savage nature of the lion to the gentleness of the lamb. His conversion has often been described as a miracle of grace. On such a man and his fellows the effect of bullets and arms would have been exasperating in the last degree.

Other and later missionaries in Africa, and in general all the most successful of their number, have followed on the same conciliatory lines of action laid down by Moffatt and Livingtone; and, it may be added, laid down by their Divine Master before them.

Nor has this pacific course been confined to the missionaries. It has been followed, also by the most successful Statesmen and by the shrewdest colonial administrators in Africa. There was indeed, a time when the bullet, but *not* Bible, policy had considerable influence in the Cape Colony in particular, and when it was especially fostered by selfish contractors and other unpatriotic persons, who endeavoured, and more than once with too much success, to drag the Colony and the Mother Country into war with the Kaffirs. A lamentable loss of life and of money was the practical result of this blundering course. But warned by the lessons of the past, later Administrators in South Africa have pursued a more sensible policy, and have treated the native races in a more conciliatory and reasonable manner. The effect has been a development of trade, commerce, colonization, and religion, incomparably superior to anything attained during the period when the counsels of bullying folly and of private greed were listened to.

It is to the better and wiser plan of peaceful measures that the people of the Cape Colony, of Natal, and of the Diamond Regions owe it to-day, that they are not massacred by infuriated natives, who, as a population, greatly exceed them in point of numbers. If the silly plan of "running amuck" with arms were generally followed by Europeans in Africa, neither their lives nor their so-called Christianity would be permitted by the native races to exist upon their Continent. The African slave-dealers will disappear when the inducements to slavery, such as the demand for ivory, in particular, are withdrawn; but mere bullets will neither suppress the slave-trade, nor its agents.

And as to the new German Chancellor, it is earnestly to be desired that whether he or the young Emperor is to be the real pilot of the great Ship of State for the future, either may steer clear of the rocks upon which a rash and oppressive policy, whether at home or abroad, would be likely to drive them. By all means let them take the Bible as their compass, but the less that they associate that sacred volume with bullets, the better will it be for themselves and for others.

BROTHERHOODS.

A PAPER BY THE REV. JOHN R. VERNON, M.A., RECTOR, ST. AUDRIE'S, BRIDGWATER.

TO vary an illustration of, I think, Mr. Spurgeon's, I will suppose the following state of affairs. A good ship is ploughing her way through the blue sea, when, on a sudden, a cry arises, "*A man overboard!*" There is a rush for boats, ropes, life-buoys, anything —everything. And the man struggles on with the blinding, choking, gurgling, drowning waters. Here is the boat, and men are about to lower it. But no, another gang dissuades them. Better to throw a rope, a life-buoy; others burst in, "No, no, *that* is not the best way! Better for some strong swimmer, or two, or three to plunge into the sea, and save the man."

And this and that experiment, and this and that suggestion is canvassed, rejected—partially accepted, set aside. There is an animated debating society, a conference, a congress upon the deck. Meanwhile the man fights on with the blinding, choking, gurgling, and yet, now, prevailing waters. Twice he has sunk, and everyone agrees that the danger is imminent, the need pressing. Only they *cannot* agree as to the best method of rescuing the man. If only they could! But at last they agree that it is best to throw a rope out to him. So far, so good. Only, now, what *kind* of rope? is the question. This is too thick, that too thin. This has the strand of an indifferent maker. This has tar on it from a former, less cleanly ship. Meanwhile, the man fights no longer. The question is settled for them. Solvitur, by the man's sinking, with a last despairing upcast of his arms, as though to protest against the stupidity, against the vacillation, against the prejudice of those who might have helped him, who were, to do them justice, *anxious* to help him. It is solved by that last expanding of ring after ring upon the smooth water where he sank. By the spiral bubbling up of the life-breath of the man, who died while his fellows, on the ship, were differing how to save him.

My riddle is not hard to read. We, safe in the good ship of the Church, have to deal with the case of not one man, but of millions, overboard. The arrears of past apathy and neglect are not yet fairly grappled with, and the needs of the present and of the future are coming upon us with the swiftness and the force of a rising flood. To take London alone, a population, they say, equal to that of Exeter, is added to it every year. To take one of its parishes, and that one of the most favoured, with eight clergy at work among 20,000, we are told, by its vicar, that, in one year, a block of eight hundred houses is added to it; that it grows at the rate of a needed new curate every year.

And these millions are growing up in worse than heathenism. And it is impossible to find ordained men enough, or funds enough to support them, with the apathy, concerning these things, among the lay folk of the Church of England. These give their "mite" (as a rule) when they should give of their abundance. And the clergy, instead of preaching self-denial for Christ's sake, and a crusade against the selfishness and worldliness of the day—the clergy pander to the world-spirit and the selfishness. They daub the tottering wall with the untempered mortar of "fashionable *charity!*" Bazaars, *et hoc genus omne.*

And then one here, and another there, starts the idea of the banding together of men who shall, for a period longer or shorter, dedicate themselves, soul, mind, body, to the King's service. Men who shall go among these seething multitudes, and do what the time of the clergy is crowded out from doing; men who shall visit the sick and the whole, and report special cases to the clergy; men who shall seek out the unbaptized, and bring the neglected baptized in for confirmation; men who might, with the Bishop's license, hold cottage meetings, and, after a shortened service, brightened with hymns, light and colour, give earnest addresses to the people.

But the strand of the rope, or the tar left in by former less clean vessels, fills the mind of some prim Protestants with horror. Fills with horror, also, it may be, some sticklers for nothing but clerical ministrations. We would not trench upon these. But, we submit, there is nothing sacerdotal, necessarily, in family prayer. Why not, then, prayer in a larger family, with allowed expositions of the Scripture read? At any rate, and this is the point, let *something* be done. Here are these myriads, drowning in dark seas of ignorance, of sin, of unbelief, of, in short, neglect. And here are we, hesitating here, demurring there, and careful of this, tentative of that, choosing ropes, debating as to means.

Meanwhile, myriads at home, not to speak of millions abroad, are struggling on with the blinding, choking, gurgling, drowning waters. Ring after ring of circles shows where a soul went down; and we hesitate, and consider, and debate! For God's sake, let us do *something!* Let us try the Brotherhoods. They can but fail. Yet the much opposed and distrusted Sisterhoods have not failed. There the frightful need is. I, for one, cannot say nay to Dissent, to Romanism, so long as the Church of the Nation is debating, and conferring, and shilly-shallying, and humming and hawing, and disagreeing here, and asking for further information there.

And, meanwhile, myriads at home, not to speak of millions abroad, are struggling in the blinding, deafening, bewildering, murderous waters. With spiral curves the life-breath of soul after soul bubbles the surface of the quiet sea.

And we wrangle, and are not sure, and consider, and debate.

For God's sake, for the sake of our perishing brethren, let us do *something!*

I. R. V.

TRADE UNIONISM.

(*Communicated.*)

TRADE-UNIONS are societies, the members of which are of the same trade, handicraft, or profession, the object of the unions into which those members enter being in general the advancement of their interests in the capacity that belongs to them as tradesmen or professional men of such and such a denomination. Under this definition come not only those societies known commonly as trades unions, but also many others, as the incorporated Society of Attorneys and Solicitors, sundry Medical societies, the Royal Academy of Arts, etc., etc. I state this to show that there is nothing different, in actual *kind*, between such associations as the Society of Amalgamated Engineers and various associations of persons who are not handicraftsmen; while, in the influence exercised by associations of tradesmen upon trade, and on industrial society, there is something that has no parallel in the influence belonging to the professional associations. In the following remarks I confine myself to the consideration of the former.

The origin of many trades unions is believed to have been thus—as disputes about wages, and terms of engagement with employers, from time to time arose, combinations among workmen were had recourse to for the purpose of conducting the negotiations needful to arrange the disputes. Other unions were in their commencement of the nature of benefit clubs. The early history of the system is probably impossible to write, because till about sixty years ago all combinations of persons employed in trade by others, were forbidden, ignored in law, and even made criminal. These prohibitive laws against combination, however, being abolished, the natural conditions in reference to the formation of such societies began to have free course. The present condition of them is, that they

have many objects that they set before them. As benefit societies, first; and secondly—while this *secondly* is to a great extent obscured from the public generally—the advancement in various ways of the interests, or supposed interests, of the combinators.

Concerning the first object of trades unions, there is nothing in particular to be observed, except that there is no reason, in the nature of benefit or insurance societies, that their members should be persons practising particular trades or handicrafts. A benefit society, composed of shopkeepers, engineers, knife-grinders, hacklers of flax, combers of wool, and so on, would be just as likely to be commercially successful, as a similar society composed of persons practising one of those trades, to the exclusion of other persons of other trades. Probably indeed the more catholic society would be the most likely to exhibit the greatest commercial or financial success. But if the persons practising the same trade happen to be more thrown into personal contact than persons of merely the same neighbourhood, it may turn out a pretty natural result, that the former set of persons should have opportunities of uniting for objects of this nature. *Esprit du corps* is, or seems, a natural thing, and its results cannot be unnatural, or mischievous, so long as they are legitimately limited.

But if *esprit du corps*, in any *corps*, society, corporation, or the like, ever proceeds so far in its operations, or ever prompts the members of the *corps* so far, as to practically interfere with, or oppose and obstruct, the interests and rights of those members of the community in general that do not belong to the *corps*, matters become different. It must of course be premised, that to draw distinctions when such is, and when such is not the case, is not always very easy. But a principle may be understood and apprehended, while its application may be a matter of some complexity.

The general tendency and bent of societies of persons who are of the same trade or profession is towards exclusiveness. This exclusiveness has naturally a tendency towards limiting the number of persons that are employed, or that are to be employed, in the particular trade or mystery (as it used to be called) of the combination. To the extent of this exclusiveness, as it operates practically, trade combinations and trade unions are hostile to the general interests of the community and its members. To the extent of the advancement of the interests of the combination, so far as that advancement does not hinder the advancement of the interests of others, there is plainly no such hostility. I go even farther than this, I will admit, that so long as a combination does not intrude upon the *rights* of others who do not belong to the particular combination, while it may apparently interfere with the general interest, the combination is still justifiable.

But it is difficult to draw the line with exactness between interests and rights. Society, and especially productive or commercial society, is a very complicated thing. It is difficult to lay down, whether it is a justifiable thing or not, for a trade society to dictate the proportion of apprentices to workmen that it will permit to be taught the mysteries of a special trade. My opinion is that it is not justifiable; but I offer this not as a rule, but as an instance. With respect to another claim, often made by trade unions or societies, the claim to prohibit all who do not belong to their union to exercise the handicraft that they exercise, I have no hesitation in saying such a claim is directly anti-social, inimical not only to the interests of the community in general, but to the interests in particular of the most needy members of it.

This article or essay that I am writing must be short; and this point, or principle, as I do believe it to be, brings me at once to the central matter, practically, of those things that at present are of very great general interest. I therefore go on to that consideration, which I believe to be the most important to be kept in view, in regard of present controversies. I should prefer to arrive at it more slowly, and to state my views concerning what may be called the industrial evolution of the present time at more length. But I feel that I must hasten.

There are at present two industrial movements in process unconnected with each other. One of them is that which is headed, as it were, by the trade unionists and their favourers. It is based on an insistance, on the part of persons employed in sundry trades, that as their employers derive profits in carrying on the trades wherein they (the workmen, unionists, or others) are engaged, they are entitled as a matter of moral right to share in those profits. Thus that if the prices of coal for instance should advance, the men who help to draw coal from the earth have a natural moral claim to have their wages raised in a kind of proportion to the increase of the price at which the coal is sold. This right or claim is often enforced by threats of leaving off ordinary work unless the increase of wages be allowed or given, and if the mine owner refuses to give it, by preventing him violently from employing other miners to dig in his mines. This violence, it is plain, has to be exercised not only against the mine owner, but also against the intended competition in the labour of mining or digging.

I here state, not only the industrial or economic theory of what wages are, but, in addition to that, the method whereby the application of the theory is in many instances actually made. It is not necessary for me to state the case as is applied in a variety of other trades.

I have first to say in regard of this, that there is no moral right on the part of any person to partake of the profit that his employer makes out of his work (as it is said). Whether or not the employer of coal diggers makes his profit *out of his diggers' labour*, or out of the demand for coal by the purchasers and consumers of it, I do not enter on. I have an opinion on the subject, but no matter. There is, I say, no moral right or claim on the part of the labourer to a share in in his employer's gain. He has made his bargain for his penny, and he is entitled to that and to nought else or more.

It may, however, be for the interest of the mine owner to take into partnership, or *quasi* partnership, the men who dig the coals, and to arrange with them, *as matter of contract*, that the wages to be earned and paid shall fluctuate with the price of the coal. This brings one to the other "industrial movement" that is now proceeding, which industrial movement may be called *profit-sharing*, or *co-operation*. It takes various forms. If I were writing an economic treatise, I might enter on their particulars. At present I am limited by my space to speaking merely of their general principle, which I indicate, as well as I am able, by the above instance; roughly it is true.

Now, I would put it to any person who loves peace and goodwill, is not the second of these systems by far—even absolutely—the most Christian in its idea

and conception? Is not the sharing, by an understood system (although difference of opinion and small quarrels may arise about minutiæ) of profits, a much more Christian thing than perpetual war and squabbles about the amount of wages, no matter whether the net money results be, or be not, the same in the end?

But this net money result will hardly ever be the same in the end. Not only the moral basis, but also the economic conception, of the "combination" system, differs from the ideas on which the "co-operative" system rests, and the methods are different as well.

Trades unions, when they want to influence the rate of wages, use as their principal weapon cessation of work and production, so annihilating the quantity of wealth that would be created had work proceeded. Co-operative workshops increase the reward of labour as well as the reward of capital, not by diminishing, but by increasing production. The logical bases of the two systems are opposed, as are their moral and economic bases. Unionists presume, whether it be known to them or not, that capitalists and workmen are natural enemies of each other. Co-operators rejoice, in heart and in pocket, at the success of both. Capitalists are the customers of labourers; the notion that a man's customer is his natural enemy is not only illogical, but absurd on its very face.

If it be said, that although workmen have no right to a share in their employer's profits (in absence of agreement concerning profits), yet they have a kind of equitable claim; I grant this. And this equitable claim comes in the ordinary course of economic progress to be realised by the growth of capital causing an increased demand for labour and a consequent increased scale of wages. This both is so, as matter of fact and history, and according to known economic law, must be so. During the last fifty years both the quantity of capital in England and the general rate of wages have more than doubled, the advance of wages having arisen through the increased demand for labour by capital. Therefore the whole machinery employed by trades unions with the purpose of affecting the rate of wages has, to a considerable extent, the reverse economic result of what is intended; for while cessation of work means loss of wages at the time, it means in addition the loss of the increase of capital that would otherwise go on, and so the diminution in the future of the capital fund from which wages come.

Besides this, there is another economic fallacy in the trades union conception. Combinations and force cannot produce a permanent effect on prices of labour or of anything else. Price is ruled by demand; and demand comes from power to purchase. Combinations of sellers to raise prices by withholding, cannot, in the nature of things, increase the purchasing power of buyers. At the very utmost, combinations may be the machinery through which results are produced or seem to be produced; a clumsy machinery, however, always. But they cannot be the *cause*, which is demand, and nought else. If the apparent results of combinations, in influencing the rate of wages, be appealed to, I answer, first, that no generalisation is of value that does not include both successful combinations and those which have not been successful; and, secondly, that one of the most notable cases of a marked advance of wages during the last half century is that of domestic servants, who have never combined, and who are so placed as to be all but incapable of forming combinations.

The true and proper use of trade societies is not economic, and is to a very small extent even social. Indeed, persons of the same trade are far more naturally competitors with each other than bound to each other by any large common interests. Where they have common interests, the advancement of which is also the advancement, in a less degree, of public interests generally, unions are no doubt capable of being useful. The promotion of good legislation—sanitary, for example—and the discouragement of mischievous legislation, are such interests.

The sound and true combination is not that between workmen against capitalists, or that between capitalists against workmen, but that between workmen and capitalists for purposes of production and such subsidiary matters as may arise. The two systems are inconsistent with each other, and are actually opposed to each other. This is instinctively felt by many of the trade unionists, while they would not admit it. It is very strikingly evidenced by their action in the case of the South London Gas Works, when a share of profits was offered to the stokers, and their false friends advised, and tried to coerce, the refusal of it. The methods of combination are unhappily becoming more violent, and more inconsistent with private persons' rights, every day, and their spirit more grudging, and more inimical to all who do not belong to them. The spirit of co-operation is essentially ungrudging. Very probably the Prophet Isaiah did not know himself to be a high economic authority; but there is no sounder economic maxim than his: "The liberal deviseth liberal things, and by liberal things shall he stand."

Reviews and Notices.

"ST. PATRICK'S BELLS." Dublin: J. Charles.

THIS is a Home Rule prognostic. It is exceedingly clever and well worth the threepence charged for it. The author is a member of the Y.M.C.A. of St. Nicholas and St. Luke's Parish, Dublin, and he deserves much praise for this able and interesting little *brochure*. It is told in the form of a dream, showing what Protestants may expect should Home Rule ever come into operation. There is no bitterness or want of charity displayed by the author; he simply expresses, in a pleasing and lively style, what many dread and fear may happen should Mr. Gladstone's Bill ever pass into law. We cordially commend the little pamphlet.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

LUX MUNDI.

SIR,—The notice of *Lux Mundi* in the PULPIT of 19th July appears to call for some remark.

I must premise that although I do not call myself a high Churchman, I fully agree with the objects and the methods of that work. I published in 1873 a book, entitled "The Scientific Bases of Faith" (now

out of print), in which I endeavoured to show that the new ideas of the universe form a better basis for faith than the old.

Your reviewer, quite accurately, says:—"An attempt is made (in this book) to reconcile their particular views of Christianity with the scientific dogma of evolution, and with the latest result of historical criticism of the Old Testament and partly of the New." Except on the subject of the Sacraments, "their particular views of Christianity" are simply Nicene Christianity—the religion whereof the distinctive doctrines are those of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement. Probably most of your readers will be as much puzzled as I am to know of what your reviewer complains when he says "The Christianity which they hold and recommend is that of Athanasius, not that of Jesus Christ."

Your reviewer says further on:—"These writers accept the doctrine of evolution as the key to the whole history of the universe and of man. But they hardly attempt to meet the two great difficulties which a Christian finds in the way of accepting that doctrine. These are: 'That the history of mankind, as stated in the old Testament and endorsed by the New, is totally different from, and irreconcilable with, that presented for our acceptance by the doctrine of evolution. To the Evolutionist, man has been gradually evolved from a succession of lower types by physical generation. To the writers of Scripture, he was, at the beginnng, made very good, formed in the image of God, but fell from his high estate. The two views are incompatible. The Christian who adopts the doctrine of evolution can no longer hold that man is fallen from a higher state, and requires redemption, restoration, recovery.'"

I reply to this that the allegorical interpretation of the Fall has been always regarded as tenable; and to me it seems obviously true. But the question how we got into our present state is of no practical importance. The important matter is that we confess ourselves to be miserable sinners needing a Saviour. And the Fall, if it were proved to be a historical fact, would in no degree tend to clear up, but rather to darken yet more, the awful question of how the existince of sin is reconcilable with the goodness of God.

Your reviewer goes on:—"The other difficulty is a physical matter. Mr. Gore and his coadjutors would feel horrified at the thought that the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, which they consider the central doctrine of Christianity, could only have taken place by the natural process of generation; but the theory which they have adopted requires from them that admission, for it knows no other way in which a human being could be born."

I am not sure whether I understand this, but I suppose it must mean that in the reviewer's opinion the belief in evolution is inconsistent with the belief in miracle. This notion is utterly baseless, and is held by the reviewer, I suppose, only because some who believe in evolution do in fact deny miracle. But in my "Scientific Bases of Faith," while basing my system on evolution, I have accepted the entire Gospel history, without any attempt to deny or to minimise the element of miracle.

Let me conclude with a remark on the unwisdom and practical dangerousness of such argument as this, with which the reviewer concludes:—"If the history of the Old Testament is to be interpreted as idealization, the same method must also be applied to the New." This kind of "argument from consequences" has no effect whatever on those who are best worth influencing, and will appear to many as an admission that Scripture is hopelessly contradicted and disproved by criticism and science. As for its logic, it would be as reasonable to say, "If you reject the Apocryphal books, there is no reason why you should not reject the Canonical ones; and if you teach that the kings of Rome are mythical, the same method must be applied to the Cæsars."

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 20th August, 1890.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—How are we to understand the word "grace." Definitions are important. Imperfect ones lead to endless errors.

In a certain modified sense, it is grace to be born in a Christian country, to have food, clothing, etc. Is this the grace of Confirmation?

The Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are means of grace of a very special kind. Confirmation is not a means of grace in the same sense; it is not a Sacrament. The Catechism teaches distinctly that there are only two Sacraments. What then is the grace of Confirmation?

I think we have a right to know in what sense this grace of Confirmation is to be understood, that we may know whether those who teach it are within the limits prescribed by the Church of England or not.

Man's nature is tripartite—body, mind, spirit. Each of these parts has functions and needs nourishment. It is of the nature of religion to nourish the last. Now we know pretty certainly when we nourish the first and second: we ought also to know whether or not we are providing for the well-being of the spirit. But here, as I take it, is where so many mistakes are made.

The Church of England teaches that the mean, so far as man is concerned, of salvation is faith. The Church of Rome as distinctly teaches that it is works. The teaching then of the two Churches is as wide as the poles asunder. Greater distinction it is impossible to make—utterly. This much is quite clear.

Now faith, as I understand it, is a function of the spirit. It is that which lays hold upon and assimilates "the bread of life and the water of life." In the soul's relation with his God, faith is receptive. It lays hold on the promises and takes the blessings. In other words, God's blessings come into the soul because it is alive to receive. Faith is the sign of life in the soul as movement is the sign of life in the body.

But the function which mainly distinguishes the mind is reason. Now it is more than possible that men may be guided by no other principle. Faith, in its proper sense, may have no place in them. I say this is well within the range of possibility. And here, I may suggest, we have the explanation of the difference between the teaching of the two Churches. "Work," says the Church of Rome, "and you will receive a reward." "Live rather," says the Church of England, "and you will get more life."

And so to we come back our question, in what sense does the grace of Confirmation come? Your readers will not be shocked at my pressing this question, when I say, that a Diocesan Inspector, in my hearing, suggested to his children that, at Confirmation they did something, on account of which and the Bishop's

laying on of hands, grace came. Grace came by doing.

The aspect of matters in this important light has been very forcibly brought home to my mind by what the papers have been saying about the late Cardinal: but *de mortuis nihil nisi bonum.* Let the dead rest in peace! But why so anxious are men to rush into the arena to do battle for a man whose doings at best are not calculated to forward the interests of true religion? Charity demands it. Does it? Then does it make no distinction between truth and error. But we shall be singular: everybody praises the Cardinal. I confess I cannot go with the multitude here. I prefer to put things in their proper places. I can explain to myself how it is possible for reason to be the guiding principle in all that he has done, and I may be pardoned for saying that the principle of true faith would have led him in a very different way.

This illustration is not irrelevant, inasmuch as those who are so ready to praise the Cardinal are just as ready to speak of "the grace of Confirmation;" this, notwithstanding that his Church calls us all heretics. In this matter, let it be said, the Church of Rome is consistent. "If salvation be of works, it is no longer of faith."

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Hôtel Grand Bretagne, Bellagio,
August, 25th, 1890.

[Grace itself we take it is spiritual food, which differs in degree rather than in kind. The means of grace are various, including the two Sacraments and Confirmation, which virtually is a Re-baptism.—ED.]

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—In his Introduction, page xxxii., Dr. Hobart says: "*ἄσημος*, the technical term for a disease without distinctive symptoms, is applied by Hippocrates to a city—*μία πόλεων οὐκ ἄσημος*—just as it is by St. Luke (Acts xxi. 39), *οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης*." But the same phrase *οὐκ ἀσήμος πόλις* is used by Euripides, Strabo, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, while Philo, the Jewish writer of the first century, has the very similar expression *οὐκ ἀσήμος φυλή*.

Dr. Hobart continues: "*ἀνάληψις*, the technical term for 'recovery from illness,' or the 'suspension of the arm, etc., in a sling,' occurs in the expression, *τῆς ῥάβδου ἡ ἀνάληψις* in Hippocrates, St. Luke's use of it, in Luke ix. 51, *τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ* being similar. But *ἀνάληψις* in Luke ix. 51 refers to the Ascension, and in the account of the Ascension in Acts i. 11, the corresponding verb, *ἀναλαμβάνειν*, occurs in the phrase *ἀναλημφθῆναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, which identical phrase is used of Elijah in 2 Kings ii. 11." It is not to the medical writers, but to the Septuagint that the author of the Acts goes for his phraseology; and though this particular word, *ἀνάληψις*, is not in the LXX., he would be quite familiar with it without any help, even from Hippocrates, inasmuch as it is used by *Thucydides*, *Plato*, *Polybius*, *Diodorus*, and *Plutarch*.

Dr. Hobart also says: "*ἀναδιδόναι*, a word applied to the distribution of nourishment throughout the body, or blood through the veins, is used by Hippocrates instead of *διδόναι* or *ἀποδιδόναι*, of a messenger delivering a letter, *οἱ τὴν τῆς πόλεως ἐπιστολὴν ἀναδόντες πρέσβεις*, St. Luke employing it in the same way in Acts xxiii. 33, *ἀναδόντες τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῷ ἡγεμόνι*." But the word *ἀναδιδόναι* occurs in the LXX. (Eccles. i. 22), while the identical phrase, *ἀναδιδόναι ἐπιστολήν*, is used by Diodorus Siculus. What proof is this of professional medical language? These words and phrases are not confined to the medical authors, and, moreover, the only authority given by Dr. Hobart in each case is Hippocrates, as to whose influence on later Greek I have already remarked.

Dr. Hobart adds: "*ἐπιχειρεῖν*, a word very much used in medical language, is employed by Hippocrates and Galen in the same way as it is by St. Luke in commencing his Gospel—St. Luke i. 1," each of these writers using the word at the beginning of one of their treatises. But *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, to take in hand, seems just the natural word to use in this way. It occurs (followed by an infinitive as in Luke) in Esther ix. 25; 2 Macc. vii. 19; and Josephus; and also among the well-known Greek authors, in *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, *Aristophanes*, and *Xenophon*.

Dr. Hobart continues: "Galen often employs *παρακολουθεῖν* exactly in the sense St. Luke does (ch. i. 3), while applying it elsewhere in a more strictly medical sense to the symptoms which accompany various diseases." And again (p. 90), "Galen uses it of paying close attention to a subject, and *joined at times with ἀκριβῶς, as here*" (Luke i. 3). But Josephus uses *παρακολουθεῖν* in the same sense, *ἀκριβῶς* occurring just before, qualifying *ἐπίστασθαι* in the corresponding and preceding clause. Polybius has *παρακολουθεῖν σαφῶς*. Demosthenes also has *εἰδέναι ἀκριβῶς*, followed in the next clause by *παρακολουθεῖν*. Liddell and Scott note the "very frequent" use of the adverb *ἀκριβῶς* with such verbs as *εἰδέναι*, *ἐπίστασθαι*, *μαθεῖν*, etc. It is clear that there is nothing peculiar to Galen here, and if there were, this would not prove medical training in the writer of the Third Gospel, one hundred years earlier.

Dr. Hobart goes on: "In a similar way we find St. Luke using words in an ordinary sense in some places which he employs in a medical signification in others, *e.g.*, *ἀδύνατος*, Luke xviii. 27, meaning 'impossible,' in Acts xiv. 8, 'impotent'; *θεραπεία*, Luke xii. 42, 'a household'; Luke ix. 11, 'medical treatment'; *ἱστάναι*, used in its ordinary sense elsewhere; and in Luke viii. 44, in a medical application, *ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος*; *ἔκστασις*, Acts iii. 10, 'astonishment,' and Acts x. 10, 'a trance.'" I have already, in a previous letter (see the PULPIT for March 8th), shown that the so-called medical meanings of *ἀδύνατος* and *ἵστανται* are to be found in the LXX. The word *θεραπεία* in the sense of "family," occurs in Gen. xlv. 16 (in the history of Joseph); and in the sense of "healing," which is the true meaning of the word, and not "medical treatment" at Luke ix. 11, is to be found in Rev. xxii. 2, and also in Josephus; *ἔκστασις*, meaning "astonishment," occurs several times in the LXX. (1 Sam. xi. 7; 2 Chron. xiv. 14, etc.), and meaning "trance," is found in Genesis ii. 21 (the account of the creation of Eve).

None of these words and phrases brought forward by Dr. Hobart prove the slightest professional medical knowledge or training on the part of the author of the Third Gospel. At the beginning of his elaborate work Dr. Hobart makes reference to the proverb, "Physician, heal thyself" (Luke iv. 23). "Here at the commencement of the Gospel," he says, "there is a slight intimation of the professional character of the writer. St. Luke is the only one of the Evangelists who records this saying of our Lord. No doubt it came home with peculiar force to the medical

Evangelist." Why should it? Luke was not present on the occasion. It is surely a very obvious remark that often physicians do not and cannot heal themselves. It does not require a professional medical training either to originate or to appreciate so plain a statement. It might almost as well be said that *any* reference to a physician implies medical training. In Matthew ix. 12 there is an observation about physicians. Was Matthew also a doctor? "But," says Dr. Hobart, "Galen speaks of a physician who should have cured himself before he attempted to attend patients." Yes, but as I have more than once remarked, Galen (who was a most voluminous writer, using many words and speaking of many things) appeared one hundred years too late to throw any light on the authorship of the Acts, and if Dr. Hobart insists that he who writes down a proverb about physicians must be himself a doctor, he will have to prove that "he who drives fat oxen must himself be fat."

H. HEBER EVANS.

August 9th, 1890.

OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION BODY.

SIR,—There are two statements now popularly made on the nature of our Lord's Resurrection Body, which present difficulties when one tries to reconcile them with Bible teaching. One is, that our Lord's body was spiritualized during the last forty days; and the other, that His body, at His resurrection, was made spiritual, glorious, immortal, and free from all human imperfections, etc. Now those who hold that our Lord's body went through a process of spiritualizing during these forty days, assert that this change was gradual in its development. This idea may be very plausible; but what circumstance is there mentioned in the Gospel account of these days, which cannot bear a different interpretation from that forced upon it by those whose object is merely to support a theory on which to build a doctrine. What reason is there why we are to regard our Lord's body after His resurrection as different at all from its former condition; except as bearing the marks of His crucifixion? And is there a single instance given us, on which can be built the assertion, that our Lord's body, at any time during those forty days, was different to the Apostles' sight from what it seemed to them before? When not recognised, it was because their eyes were holden, not that His body was changed; in fact, it was simply a miracle. This must be so, because if their eyes were not miraculously holden, would they not instantly have perceived the wound-prints in His hands and feet? Those who hold that this spiritualizing went on during the forty days, may say that such a process would not, and need not make any outward, visible change in our Lord's bodily appearance; and that this would also account for the complete silence of the Gospel narrative on the circumstance. But is not all this mere conjecture, and while we can draw no such conclusion from Scripture, it is difficult to see how any are warranted in stating questionable facts, and on such to build far more questionable doctrines? Adding to Scripture or detracting from it has a penalty attached, and this consideration might prevent any from becoming liable to the same: and the desire to appear to possess knowledge above what is written may be the only incentive with those whose interpretations often transgress the bounds of literary exactness.

So far as to the first statement. The objections to the second commonly expressed statement—which says that our Lord's body at the moment of His resurrection was made glorious, immortal and spiritual, in fact, became a totally different body from what He had before His death—are, some of them, also founded on the fact of its bearing the wound-prints. Now our Lord's resurrection body is to be regarded, it is said, as the sample of the resurrection body of all hereafter. Is it not fair then to ask, must every body at its resurrection carry the marks which it bore at death, and even the wounds which caused its death? This, it seems, is an insurmountable difficulty against applying St. Paul's words, "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body" to our Saviour's body at His resurrection. Nor can we argue from the condition of His body at His resurrection, to that of the future bodies of others. The words "the first fruits of them that slept" mean, that our Lord's resurrection made the resurrection of all others a certainty, and proved that they must rise again. Some have thought that the new resurrection body will be, in form and appearance, quite different from the present body; arguing from the analogy used by St. Paul of seed. The form of the plant being so totally different from that of the seed, out of which it sprang. If this be a correct view, and the risen bodies of Christians are to be as different in appearance as the seed and the plant, then how can we say that our Lord's body, after His resurrection, still carrying the marks of His crucifixion, was His glorified, spiritualized body? But is this theory quite in accordance with Scriptural teaching; and does the scene at the Transfiguration help to bear it out? Of course, it may be said that the wound prints disappeared after a time, when they had served their purpose in assisting the disciples to identify their Risen Lord. But is not even this mere conjecture? There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body, as St. Paul says. But can both exist together; or can the former acquire the qualities or properties of the latter, and yet not lose its own identity? Our Lord's natural body may have undergone some change at or after His ascension; but here Scripture leaves us also without proof. May we then assert, founding our ideas on what are commonly called "natural inferences derived from New Testament history," that our Lord's body either during the forty days, or at the moment of His resurrection, underwent such a change that it might be called His glorified, spiritualized, resurrection body?

I must apologise for the length of this letter.

INQUIRENS.

THE MALTESE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

SIR,—It is hard to understand what our Government have done in this matter with Rome. As to marriages, when both are Romanists, of course Rome settles that, and we object not. When both parties are Church people or Protestant Dissenters, Rome cannot interfere. The only case left is that of one party being a Romanist and the other not. Does Rome pretend, in such cases, to annul the marriage and bastardize the children? Does Lord Salisbury agree to this? Incredible! It may be the case of many of our soldiers in Malta marrying natives. May they evade such marriages, and marry over again, when they return home or go to any of the colonies?

This is the way the matter stood in Ireland in the Yelverton time, when a marriage was invalid, if performed by a Romish priest, between a Romanist and a Protestant. This was thought insufferable on Romanists; and now it is to be made our case, if a soldier is married by his own clergyman to a Romanist. If the case be this, all necessary is to expose it. No government can stand by this without falling.

C. C., V.-G.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Addison, Rev. James Salmon, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bradford ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.

Arnold, Rev. H. A., Senior Curate of St. Helens ; Vicar of Barrow, near Chester.

Badcock, Rev. Charles Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Silas's, Hunslet, Leeds.

Cocks, Rev. F. R., M.A., late Assistant Curate of Holy Trinity, Guildford ; Rector of Copmanford-with-Upton, Huntingdon.

Covey, Rev. R., Curate-in-Charge of Dry Drayton, Cambridge.

Drewe, Rev. Ernest, Curate-in-Charge of Port Isaac, St. Endellion ; Vicar of Lostwithiel, Cornwall.

Goode, Rev. Arthur Barrett. Curate of St. Mark's, Nottingham; Curate-in-Charge of All Souls', Old Radford, Nottingham.

Gray, Rev. Herbert Brice, M.A., Curate of Church Eaton, Stafford ; Vicar of Criftins, Salop.

Handcock, Rev. R. G., M.A., Incumbent of All Saints', Bath ; Vicar of St. Peter's, Lee, Kent.

Hutchinson, Rev. A. S., M.A., Vicar of Eynsford, Kent.

Hutton, Rev. F. R. C., M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Bolton.

Kermode, Rev. Sidney Alfred Pizey, M.A., Assistant-Curate of Ballaugh, Isle of Man.

Maddison, Rev. William, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Tynemouth ; Organising Secretary to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for the Diocese of Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Markham, Rev. Arthur, M.A., English Chaplain, Budapest.

Parker, Rev. W. H., M.A., Curate of the Parish Church, Wokingham ; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Barbados and the Windward Islands.

Pollock, Rev. Edward Downing, A.K.C., Vicar of Tamworth ; Rural Dean.

Reed, Rev. Martin, M.A., Vicar of Lenton, near Grantham ; Rector of Eastwell and Boughton Aluph, near Ashford, Kent.

Sheringham, Rev. W. A., M.A., Rector of Donington ; Rural Dean of Shifnal.

Sweet-Escott, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Stivichall, Warwickshire ; Vicar of Broomfield, Somersetshire.

Symonds, Rev. Edward, Domestic Chaplain to Earl Cadogan.

Vickers, Rev. W. V., English Chaplain at Patras, Greece (renewed).

Walker, Rev. J. H., Vicar of Poddington, Beds.

Warren, Rev. F. E., B.D., Rector of Frenchay ; Rector of Bardwell, Bury St. Edmund's.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ferguson, Rev. Richard, late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Rector of Durley, Hampshire, at Great Malvern, on the 28th ult., aged 75.

Joseph, Rev. Alexander, Hon. Canon of Rochester Cathedral, some time Rector of St. John's, Chatham, and Rural Dean, at Great Malvern, on the 26th ult., aged 68.

Stratton, Rev. William, at Gressingham Vicarage, on the 22nd ult., aged 59.

Watt, Rev. Robert, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, at the Rectory, Cheadle, on the 21st ult., aged 73.

Westmore, Rev. Henry Holme, late Rector of Hutton, Essex, at his residence, 20, Campden-hill-road, Kensington, on the 29th ult., in his 75th year.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE LABOUR OF LOVE.

By the Ven. S. CHEETHAM, D.D., Archdeacon and Canon of Rochester.

Sermon Preached in Rochester Cathedral, May 4th, 1890.

"Your work of faith and labour of love."—1 Thess. i. 3.

IN the collect for the fourth Sun dayafter Easter, we pray God to grant to us that we may love the thing which He commands, and desire that which He doth promise. If we could attain this perfectly, if we could really have our minds, our affections, so utterly and entirely conformed to the will of God, that we loved nothing else but that which He commands; if we looked forward with joy to nothing but that which God doth promise; our whole life would be sweet, peaceful, harmonious, joyful. In a word, our life would be *angelic;* we should do God's will on earth as it is done in Heaven, simply because we should be strongly impelled to do it by the spirit of love burning within us; we should never desire to do anything but God's will; we should not be conscious of any pressure of the external law upon us, to compel us to do this or that, because we should be moved by the inner law to do right, just as the planet keeps its orbit in consequence of the laws which God has given to the material universe. The planet does not need any hard rigid circle to run upon, because the attraction to the central sun, which God has impressed upon it, is alone sufficient to cause it to run its course. We are not angels, we do not live such a life as man might have lived in Paradise, yet God teaches us to aspire towards the angelic life when He teaches us to pray that His will may be done on earth as it is in heaven. This is the ideal which we ought to keep before us; with no lower ideal ought we to be content. To say this, is to say that we ought never to be satisfied with ourselves in this life, but should be always going on towards perfection.

But this is not the way with most of us. A good many of us, I am afraid, do not even think about it, and a good many more, who do think about it, are content with thinking. Acting is so much more troublesome than thinking. But thinking without acting is not altogether a wholesome occupation.

> Oh! contemplation palls upon the spirit
> Like the chill silence of an autumn sun,
> While action, like the roaring south-west wind,
> Sweeps, laden with elixirs, with rich draughts
> Quickening the wombed earth.

Wholesome thought leads to action, and brings forth much fruit; unwholesome thought dies in the mind which conceived it, and taints the whole being with the odour of corruption.

But how do men in general live? How do they regard the great problems of life? What great principles run through their lives?

I think if we look out upon the world, we shall find that, in this respect, men fall mainly into three classes—classes melting by imperceptible shades into each other, but still in the main recognisable.

A man may have no principle in his life at all. A man may, and a great many men do, drift through life as the various winds and currents may drive them. The worst cases of this unprincipled living are of course to be found among those who are not compelled to earn their living. There are persons to be found among those who neither toil nor spin, who seem to have no more serious care about the purpose for which they were sent into the world than the flowers that blow. They are very unhappy, because they do not fulfil the end of their being as the flowers do, and they very often seem to think that they will die like the flowers. The necessity of working for his living, at any rate, saves a man from this lowest degradation. The labour by which a man earns his bread is always respectable, and—if it be taken in the right spirit—is the best possible discipline. But among the great army of workers also—workers with their brains as well as with their hands—there are too many who have no high principle in their lives; who simply eat and drink, work and play, sleep and wake, without much thought whether there is anything above the mere bodily wants of this present life.

Now, many of the persons whom I describe would be very much shocked indeed to be told that they are atheists; and yet, if a man lives entirely for work and play, if he practically lives without God in the world, what is he but an atheist? Surely the *practical* denial of God is at least as bad as the theoretical. And I believe, to come to lower ground, that the best workers are not to be found in the class which I am describing. The man who is drifting through life does not put conscience into his work. He does his work just well enough to satisfy his employer, and no better, and he has no very great objection to get money by unfair means, so long as he is not found out. Drifting through life is not good either for the bodily, the moral, or the spiritual nature of man.

This is one class,—the drifting class. Then there is another, the great class of those who try to regulate their lives on the principle of duty; to conform themselves to the great laws which God has given to the world, so far as they are able to discern them. The old pagan seekers after truth sought these laws in the world around them, as St. Paul tells us, and in the inward monitor which accused or excused them. Those who are within the Church search for them in God's own revelation

of Himself. A man, I say, may recognise a law above those which are made by man, he may lay down rules for himself, and try to conform himself in all things to the standard set before him. And this so far as it goes, is a noble effort. Men who have attempted to regulate their lives by duty, have, I believe, often attained a truth, purity, and honesty of life, which may put to shame the lives of many who look down upon them as formalists. But, weak as our wills are to good, the sense of duty is not enough. It is constantly observed that men of this class tend to become hard and unsympathising, and over-severe towards the faults of others. And moreover, in such a life, though habit is a great help, there is always a sense of *effort* to keep right, an effort which sometimes seems hardly worth making. The man who thinks of duty only, is something like a traveller who plods on steadily from day to day, in the direction which his compass tells him is the right one, but taking no great pleasure in the objects by the wayside, and looking for no great happiness at the end of his courney. Such a man would always be tempted to stand still. It would be with an effort that he would start on his journey every morning, looking for no new delight in the day to come. The great examples of duty without love are to be found in the ancient sect of the Stoics. Now these men are to be held in all honour. They held up a high standard before a corrupt generation, and they scattered many seeds which afterwards blossomed in the sunshine of Christianity. Nor would it be right to say that they were unsympathetic. It was mainly to them that the old world was indebted for the thought of the brotherhood of humanity, the kindred of man, as man. But the sense of unsupported effort was too much for them. To hold fast to a standard, about which they were after all not too sure, in the midst of "the burden and the mystery of all this unintelligible world," was too much for them. Some broke down in practice, and lived carelessly while they theorised sternly. Some were seized with disgust at life, which they thought no longer worth living. No sect produced so large a proportion of suicides as the Stoic. And it is in one of these two directions, self-indulgence or disgust at life,—or both together, for they are not at all incompatible,—that men tend who do not *love* the thing which God commands, or *desire* that which He doth promise. Reason without emotion is like the pilot of a ship forsaken by the winds in a profound calm.

But there is yet another class—the class of those who love their work, and consequently do it easily and well, without any sense of effort. It has become almost a proverb, that the labour we delight in has no pain. If a man loves his work, and has an end before him which he very much desires to attain, he goes forward easily and naturally. He is in no danger of standing still, or of doing his work in a careless and perfunctory manner, simply because he loves it. That, and I believe that alone, is a sufficient moving power. A man who has this motive within him, who has before him something which he ardently desires, will be always devising something to help to realise it in fact; to make that an outward reality which is so vividly present to his own mind. Wherever he goes, whatever he is doing, he is always finding hints to forward his darling object. It is the centre round which all his thoughts cluster. And for this he will make great sacrifices of his own comfort and convenience. You can hardly take up the life of one of the great workers who have attained to fame without finding that his history is that of earnest devotion to some object, and of great sacrifices made to attain it. Take the case, for instance, of some great naturalist, of one whose soul is filled with a burning desire to know more and more of what we call Nature,—that is, of that portion of the universe in which God has permitted us to discover the order and sequence in which he works. Such a man will seize every opportunity of extending his knowledge; he will often see in the things around him a great deal which an ordinary observer does not see; very often he will gladly undertake expeditions which to many of us would be long-continued misery; a long voyage, perhaps, in a small vessel not adapted for passengers, a tedious and exhausting march over barren sands and burning rock; he will draw from the depths of the sea objects which fill him with delight; or in the desert the sight of some of the strange plants which are specially adapted to live there, or of some fossil in the rock, will suddenly fill up some blank in his knowledge of the universe. There is no need to tell such a man to lay aside every weight, everything which may hinder him in the pursuit of his darling object. He will of course do so; his devotion to what he considers the work of his life will of course secure that; he will give little attention to other matters, simply because all his thoughts and energies are given to one. In such a case, a man's love of his work overcomes many of his natural failings, indolence, carelessness, and the like, to which we are all more or less liable. It leads him to despise self-indulgence, and to seize every opportunity of improving himself in the kind of knowledge to which he devotes himself. And in all this he has not much sense of effort. He has at all events none of that painful effort to "make up his mind" about a course of action which so often saps our energies and renders our lives feeble and ineffectual.

I have taken the case of a naturalist. But go where you will, you will find in the history of the great and successful workers, whether in art, in literature, in science, or in mechanics, the same two principles, love of the work and sacrifice for it.

Now apply this to our spiritual life and work. If a man really loves that which God commands and desires that which He doth promise, then he will be led on easily and naturally to serve God

and overcome the world. If a man's thoughts are bent on the realities of Christ's Kingdom ; if he is eager to know more of it, and in the end to attain that which God has promised, even that knowledge of Himself which is eternal life, he will neglect nothing which may help to attain this, and sacrifice anything which may hinder him in his course. Such a man, it is needless to say, will not break the outward law. He will not murder nor steal nor bear false witness. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. But much more than this ; in all the circumstances of life he will act instinctively, as we say, as becomes a servant of Christ. The love of Christ constraineth him. It influences him constantly in the same way that a cultivated sense of propriety influences well-bred persons in the world. It is a part of himself. In the thousand things which depend on character rather than on law—meekness, gentleness, brotherly kindness, and the like,—he will act naturally and without conscious effort as becomes a servant of Christ, nay, a friend of Christ ; for our Lord does not disdain to call us friends. If we love Christ, if we are always conscious that we belong to the great society of which He is the Head, that all-pervading thought will lead us to act, in thought and word and deed, as men should do who love God's commandments above gold and precious stone.

"*TALITHA CUMI.*"

A Funeral Sermon on Mary Birkett of Wythburn.

By the Rev. SAMUEL BARBER, Curate of the Parish.

Preached in Wythburn Church, on Sunday, August 10th, 1890.

"And He took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha Cumi ; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise."—St. Mark, v. 41.

THE great astonishment which St. Mark here tells us took possession of the people on beholding the little maid whom Jesus had just raised from the bed of death was in striking contrast to the singularly calm self-sustained dignity of the Lord Himself. Amid all the wailing and moaning of the sorrow struck parents and, doubtless, as was the Eastern custom, of the hired mourners—the matchless dignity, the mysterious presence and the sweet gentleness of the Son of Man were like the morning sun fresh risen from behind the mountain top and now pouring his glad and soul reviving beams o'er the beauties of the newly wakened earth, and chasing far away the mists and troubles of the night.

Such must have been the power and blessedness of the Divine Presence of the prophet of Nazareth when He spake those endearing yet mighty words "Talitha Cumi," at whose sound the dearly loved little maiden arose from the grasp of the King of Terrors as naturally as if just called from her little bed by the welcome voice of her affectionate mother.

"Talitha Cumi!" There is something unspeakably tender in these two sweet and musical Aramaic words which St. Mark has kept for us and imbedded in the text of his graphic narrative. Well might he feel that their simple force of gentleness would kindle a thrill of gratitude and devotion not only in the hearts and minds of those for whom they were spoken, but in the souls of sympathetic brethren throughout every age of the Church.

The words and manner of our Lord on this occasion seemed to call to our minds the circumstances that attended His calling back to life the widow's son at Nain.

Before approaching the bier on which the young man lay, He observes, and is moved to compassion by the grief of the poor heart-broken widow. The living sufferer was the first object of His healing power. "Weep not," He says. Then, He turns to the poor lifeless body with those mighty words : "Young man I say unto thee, Arise." He soothes the sorrow-stricken mother by His comforting Presence before He calls back the dead from the world of spirits.

Yes, there is no hurry or excitement in the blessed and beneficent work of that Just One of whom the wise man might truly say : "His path was as the shining light which shineth more and more unto perfect day."

"He hath done all things well : He maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak," were the words of the thankful and delighted people when they witnessed His healing miracles. "I must work the works of My Father while it is day," said Jesus, "the night cometh in which no man can work." In the volume of God's book it was written that He came to do the will of God and at the end He could say : "I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do."

Perfect in character, perfect in manner, and perfect in their timely appropriateness and adaptation to circumstance, the kind and thoughtful deeds of the Lord Jesus constantly invite us to ponder more and more deeply upon the miracles that He wrought. Not only, my friends, to reflect upon the works themselves that He accomplished, but upon the wonderful manner and perfect grace with which He did them.

In the actions of the Son of God while He walked this earth, we seem to discern the same perfect movement that characterises the orbs of heaven as they move in silent majesty through the vast and mysterious realms of space. Their harmony of motion, majestic order and variety of disposition, their unsullied purity and measureless distance from the turmoil and pollution of earth, will always render the aspect of the heavens a source of peace and refreshment to the weary soul.

It is narrated of a criminal condemned to death that when he was asked on the night before his execution whether anything more could be done for him, he begged that he might be taken from his cell to gaze once more upon the starlit sky. Doubtless, the sight of that wonderful picture of God's glory, the handiwork of His providence, would recall to his mind the memory of mercies in the past and awaken the hope of mercy in that spirit world which was so near to him. When we consider the vastness of the Divine plan in the heavens and the inconceivable force by which it is sustained, we may well repeat the words of the Psalmist:—"What is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visitest him?"

Yet let us remember, brethren, that all this glory and majesty of Nature is but for a season and shall pass away and be changed by the same Hand that first created it. "The grass withereth, the flower falleth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever." "Behold, saith the Lord, I make all things new."

And now let me say, my dear friends, to every mourner here to-day, and especially to those who lament the dear little one lately taken from us. In Jesus all things are new, and all things fresh and young. He is the Author of life, and the fountain of it. He came, as He tells us Himself, that we might have life, and that we might have it more abundantly. Observe this word, brethren, more abundantly. Not according to the hard and fast notions of men, nor in accordance with our own deservings, but from the inexhaustable treasures of Divine love, and for His own glory, hath He opened for us, for all repentant sinners, the fountain of life and the gates of the kingdom of heaven. "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price."

Mysterious, indeed, are the trials and bereavements that He sends to His people to prepare them for the inheritance of saints, but all are directed by the hand of love and shall work together for their good. We see how the little ones, just like the short-lived flowers of spring, appear for a season and then suddenly fade away and return to the Father of Spirits; we have seen lately taken from our midst one whose innocent face, sprightly cheerfulness, and unselfish disposition had endeared her to every resident in this place, and the large congregation gathered together at her funeral on Sunday last expressed in a striking manner the sympathy which we all feel to-day with those left behind in their pilgrimage.

In the quiet hour of meditation we seem at times to hear the sweet strains, the chanted praises of the blessed children who have gone to realise their Saviour's love: the gates now and then seem to be ajar and the sound of children's Hosannas seems to be wafted to us from the mansions of eternal light, and then this earth and its pollution seem to recede far away into the past. Let us look onward, brethren; let us ever look to Jesus, the Author and the Finisher of our faith. In all the afflictions of His people He hath been afflicted; He hath carried and borne them in His arms through the days of old, and the angel of His presence hath saved them. So too will it be with all who now look to Him for consolation and rest.

"Talitha Cumi"! How blessed were those sweet words that brought joy and light to that Jewish household 1800 years ago.

In Jesus are all things new. He Himself is the Resurrection and the Life. His word is the law of life here below: the law of duty. Let us go on with a good courage. There is work to be done. The word of Christ is that blessed guide of which the poet wrote:—

> "Thou who art Liberty and Law
> When empty terrors over-awe.
> From vain temptations dost set free
> And calm'st the weary strife of frail humanity."

Let us strive to have our conversation in heaven, and when at last the great "Talitha Cumi"! shall sound forth and the Bride herself—the whole ransomed Church of God—shall rise glorious from the grave at the voice of the Son of Man, and adorned with the garments of holiness and praise and love, then, my friends, may you and I with all the loved and lost, go forth to meet Him with songs and everlasting joy, and reign with Him for ever.

Then, from that pure and peaceful clime where the storms of sorrow and anguish come no more, where sadness and grief shall be banished for ever by the light of eternal love,—there, brethren, we shall doubtless know that the chastisement of the Lord was the truest evidence of His care.

How often are we occupied with the profitless vanities of a perishing life! How often do we forget that "The things which are seen are temporal, the things not seen eternal." Here have no continuing city but seek one to come, whose Builder and Maker is God. There shall be gathered together an innumerable company which no man can name, all who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. And the boys and girls shall play in the streets of the city, which hath no need of the sun nor of the moon; for the glory of God shall lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.

> "The land beyond the sea!
> Sometimes distinct and near,
> It grows upon the eye and ear
> And the gulf narrows to a thread-like mere—
> We seem halfway to thee
> Calm land beyond the sea.
>
> "The land beyond the sea!
> Sweet is thine endless rest,
> But sweeter far that Father's breast
> Upon thy shore eternally possessed;
> For Jesus reigns o'er thee,
> Calm land beyond the sea"!

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1890.

WHAT AUTHORITY HAVE OUR LORD'S WORDS?

(*Communicated.*)

THIS is one of the main questions of the day. The Bishop of Carlisle speaks thus: "We have no right to argue that in virtue of His divine nature He must have known the truth, and that He could not have said anything that was opposed to the truth." We may leave out the qualifying clause, "in virtue of His divine nature," and simply ask, is He an infallible guide?

This English startling statement is re-echoed by our leading ritualistic authority in Dublin. He has an article on our Lord's authority in the *Expositor* for this month, which takes away one's breath as one reads it.

Because, during our Lord's pupilage, He grew in wisdom, the writer makes this growth go on during His Messiahship. "The intellectual High Priest of humanity must not be omniscient without labour and conquest" (p. 91). Very true! But were not His thirty years sufficient for this preparation? If He was learning during His teaching, where is the line to be drawn? At what chapters of the several Gospels, does His infallible wisdom begin? Or was He ever infallible at all?

The writer argues that a reformer must have the defects of his time. At page 92 we are asked "would not reason suggest to us that, as it is the ordained condition of humanity that, as surely as man is born in time and place, he must be content with the knowledge of his time and place, so our Lord, when He took humanity on Him in local and temporal conditions, took also the limits of natural knowledge, which belonged to the condition He assumed?" This is very well, as to astronomy and such matters, but not so as to the meaning of the Old Testament. I would rather argue in an opposite direction. If our Lord came to correct the ideas and teaching of the Jews, was it not to be expected that He would come protected from their errors.

At page 93 we read, "His treatment of the Bible seems to be a perfect example of its use in every stage of critical knowledge. He treats the Holy Book with reverence, yet with freedom. He discerns the spiritual point of every passage. He knows what, in it, is eternal truth, and what was written because of the hardness of heart of the generation to whom it came. He proclaims that man is greater than any ordinance made for man. This is His example for Bible readers." This seems to say that Scripture encouraged the Jews in their errors. At any rate, as our Lord could separate the error from the truth, so we are able to do the same.

On looking back to page 91 we find, "We know that we must put some limits to the participation of the Divine attributes by our Saviour on earth. No one can ascribe to Him omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience all at once, and all completely." Very well! but were not the thirty years sufficient for preparation. Let us take the three attributes in order. First we have omnipresence, this we are told came gradually. This cannot refer to our Lord's Deity, for that was always omnipresent, "the Son of Man, which is in Heaven." But perhaps it is His manhood that is spoken of. Does the writer then pretend that our Lord's Body became omnipresent? This is the Popish ground for an adorable corporal presence. Next comes omnipotence. "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth," says our Lord. He uses it from the beginning of His Ministry. Omniscience comes last. If our Lord had not this as to doctrine, we need not talk of astronomy, He was unfit to teach. I suppose the Apostles will be held equally uncertain guides; so we shall have no sufficient teacher but the Church, which is perhaps what the writer is leading us to. We come at last to the favourite points, Lot's wife and Jonah. At page 97 we are told that, as allegories, they are as useful as if they were histories. Did not our Lord know that, as well as the writer? Did He not use parables, as the Prodigal Son and Dives and Lazarus. If He meant to teach by myths, or fables, could He not have done so? Why then quote fables, as if they were histories? Was He mistaken? Knowing the truth, did He deceive in order to please the Pharisees? If the Pharisees thought these things fables, why did they not correct our Lord for speaking of them as histories. If the Pharisees knew them to be true histories, and our Lord treated them as such, how is it that we have now found them out to be fables? As to our Lord's resurrection, if He told people that it

would take place, as surely as a mere fable, like Jonah's history, what could they think but that it was all a myth? And what can we think now but that it is all a myth like Jonah coming forth from the whale's mouth?

This writer mentions our Lord speaking of the sun's rising, as Joshua did of its standing still. But what does this prove, but that both spoke so as to be understood? What would the Jews have thought if Joshua told the earth to stand still, or our Lord spoke of the earth turning? People must always speak so as to be understood, or else they should not speak at all.

The whole article is well worth reading. It is well calculated to show to what lengths a good and learned man may go, when he starts on the dangerous course of uttering new things in order to startle and attract, by his originality and freedom from popular prejudices. Origen struck on this rock, and so have many others from his day to ours.

DEATH OF CANON LIDDON.

We announce with the deepest regret the death of Canon Liddon, which occurred somewhat suddenly on Tuesday forenoon at No. 13, Claremont Crescent, Weston-super-Mare. The deceased divine attended the funeral of the late Earl of Carnarvon, at Highclere, on the 3rd of July, and there caught cold. Within a week he was reported to be suffering from gout in the head, and lying at Christ Church, Oxford, where he was attended by Sir Henry Acland and Mr. Mallam. After some time the violence of the attack abated, and Dr. Liddon was able to visit his sister, Mrs. King, at her residence in Gloucestershire. On Friday last, by the advice of his brother, Dr. Edward Liddon, the invalid was removed to Weston-super-Mare, for the sake of change of air and perfect quiet. The journey exhausted him for a time, but he recovered rapidly from this fatigue, and was able to enjoy a carriage drive on each of the three following days. On Monday he remarked that he thought he had entirely recovered from the weakness following upon the railway journey. The following morning he partook of breakfast with Mrs. King and her daughters, and made no complaint of feeling any worse than usual. Shortly after the meal, however, Canon Liddon was found in a fainting condition. Dr. Rossiter, who had attended him since his arrival at Weston, was sent for; but the reverend gentleman had died before the doctor entered the house. Dr. Rossiter could only declare that life was extinct, owing to the failure of the heart's action.

Henry Parry Liddon, the son of a medical man at Taunton, was born in that pleasant Somersetshire town in 1829, and was educated privately till he entered Christ Church, Oxford, where he took a Second-class in Classics in 1850, and became a student. In the following year he was appointed Johnson Theological Scholar, and in 1852 was admitted a deacon by the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce), and advanced to the priesthood the following year by the same prelate, who in 1854 appointed him Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon, the Rev. A. Pott (now Archdeacon of Berkshire) being the principal, and the Rev. E. King (now Bishop of Lincoln) the chaplain.

As Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon.

The five years he was at Cuddesdon were the most eventful, probably, in his life. Mr. Golightly was unceasingly attacking the college, for the alleged High Church tendency of its teaching, from articles in the *Quarterly* to sixpenny pamphlets, and the brunt of the opposition fell on Mr. Liddon, who by his wonderful lectures, especially on the Greek Testament, and in his walks with the students, obtained a most marvellous influence over them. As there were at least three future editors pupils at the college—Mr. Burnand, of *Punch*, being one of them—it is curious that no detailed account of that stormy period has been published. The Bishop of Oxford, writing to Mr. Golightly in 1857, said: "I think my Vice-Principal eminently endued with the power of leading men to earnest, devoted piety; but with such a man I do not think I ought to interfere except as to anything substantially important." In 1858, when Mr. Pott resigned the principalship, Mr. Liddon also tendered his resignation of the vice-principalship, and the Bishop accepted it after consultation with Mr. Butler, now Dean of Lincoln (who pleaded for toleration), whose curate Mr. Liddon had been at Wantage, and the Bishop based his decision not only on abstract doctrinal difference as to the Holy Communion, but said, "It is as much or more a moral question. I am sure he is entirely honest. In exact proportion to the fulness of my conviction that he is honest, and it is entire, rises the conviction that in this matter he is not, so to speak, trustworthy—that is, that there is in him a strength of will and ardour, a restlessness, a dominant imagination, which makes him unable to give to the young men any tone, even exactly his own tone." The Bishop with regret accepted his resignation, but his friendship with Mr. Liddon never abated, and in 1860 he took part in the first "retreat" at Cuddesdon. At this time Mr. Liddon's fame as a preacher was not generally known, but probably no sermon he has ever delivered in the zenith of his fame could excel an Advent one delivered at the reopening of North Moreton Church, of which his life-long friend, the Rev. A. Barff, was vicar, in which he gave a vivid description of the Judgment Day, the recollection of which is still fresh in the memory of many who heard it more than thirty years ago.

Preacher at Oxford.

Mr. Liddon returned to his rooms at Christ Church, and as the confidential friend of Dr. Pusey exercised an immense influence on the Church politics of the time. In 1863 he was appointed for the first time Select Preacher before the University of Oxford, an office which he subsequently held on three occasions, and once within the last decade at Cambridge. His Bampton Lectures in 1866 on "The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" increased his growing reputation, and in 1864 he was appointed to the Prebendal Stall of Major Pars Altaris in Salisbury Cathedral and chaplain to the Bishop (Hamilton), whose warm personal friend he was, and a sketch of whose life he wrote. His sermons before the University had a large circulation, but his "Lent Lectures" at St. James's, Piccadilly, which first brought him before the London world, rapidly ran through five editions. Among his many literary publications may be mentioned a "Report of the Proceedings at the Bonn

Re-union Conference in 1874, with a Preface;" "A Letter to Sir John Coleridge on the Purchas Judgment;" "A Father in Christ, with a Notice of the Paper by Dr. Hatch;" "Church Troubles"—besides translations of and prefaces to many devotional books. He was a contributor to the "Christian Remembrancer," and—like his friend Dean Church—to the *Guardian*. While at Oxford he was consulted by vast numbers of Churchmen, and was in almost daily close communication with Dr. Pusey. He was a member of the Hebdomadal Council, and in 1870, when Mr. Gladstone, of whom he was always a warm supporter, offered him a Canonry of St. Paul's, the University conferred on him the degree of D.D., D.C.L., and the Ireland Professorship of the Exegesis of Holy Scripture. Here, as in his Cuddesdon lectures, his manipulation, so to speak, of the sacred text was something marvellous, and his knowledge of the technicalities, intricacies, and inner meaning of the Scriptures was unique.

The Canonry of St. Paul's.

On entering on his duties at St. Paul's he found that Canon Gregory, with the full concurrence of Dean Mansel, who held the Deanery for so short a period, had already transformed the services, and had begun to breathe life into the great church of the metropolis. In the following year Mr. Gladstone nominated the Rev. R. W. Church, one of his oldest friends, and a strong Liberal, to the Deanery; and since that period Canon Liddon's life has been known and read of all men. The secret of the maintenance of his pulpit power is probably to be found in the fact that, like Bishop Magee, though much to the loudly-expressed disappointment of his friends, he has declined to be constantly preaching. His sermons were prepared with great care, and always written out. The magic of his voice, the charm of his manner, the keenness of his eye, the elegance of his diction, and his almost Pauline powers of sarcasm, rendered his sermons rare intellectual treats.

Afternoons in the City Cathedral.

Sunday afternoon church-going is not popular. It interferes with the midday meal, whether luncheon or dinner. Yet for an hour before service began, from all parts of the metropolis people of all classes thronged to hear the great orator, whose transparent earnestness and burning zeal had so great an influence on men, the large proportion of which in the congregation was always so noticeable. Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone alike were to be found occasionally among his hearers, while Lord Crewe, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Lavie, and, till his death, the Rev. Nutcombe Oxenham, a Roman Catholic, never missed a sermon. Just as Archdeacon Denison, so splendid a platform speaker, is a comparatively ineffective preacher, so Canon Liddon did not shine on a platform, where he rarely appeared, his chief speech of note being at a large meeting at St. James's Hall in defence of the Athanasian Creed, as to which he and Dr. Pusey had both said that if it was touched they should resign their preferments. In the improvements in the services and arrangements at St. Paul's, in the midday addresses to business men in Lent, in the decoration of the fabric, and especially in the erection of the new reredos, the Canon took a lively concern, but in the business of the cathedral Canon Gregory always bore the labour oar. Canon Liddon was at once a great theologian and a great preacher. He was never married, and his sister lived with him. He was far from strong, and after his great public efforts he was thoroughly exhausted.

In Social Life.

Canon Liddon, though to a certain extent a recluse, was very good company. He possessed no ordinary sense of the ridiculous, and was in some respects, especially on the Eastern Question, a keen politician. His travels with Canon MacColl in Bulgaria are well known, and later he went to Jerusalem, where he cultivated very friendly relations with the Eastern Bishops. His one sermon before the Queen gave offence, it was always said, to her Majesty because after the manner of French Bishops he addressed her personally; and rumour said, we believe untruly, that the Queen was opposed to his further preferment. For many years the Canon spent New Year's Day at Hatfield with the Marquis of Salisbury, and his ascetic face watching the servants' ball that ushered in the New Year was a sight to behold. Some of his happy retorts in letters to the *Times* on Mr. Cavendish Bentinck and others who opposed the policy of the Dean and Chapter are familiar to the public, but one of his happiest replies was when the late Lady Cairns asked him one Good Friday afternoon what he thought of her son-in-law, the Rev. H. N. Sherbrooke, who had been preaching in the Cathedral; "With a little more attention to the proportion of events, and more accurate study of the Old Testament types, he has the elements of a good preacher." The Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson), who was present, said, "I shall never forget the intonation of the voice and the twinkle of the Canon's eye; but Lady Cairns only took in the last part of the sentence," which she quoted everywhere. Bishop Temple appointed him to the Chancellorship of the Cathedral in 1884, in succession to Bishop Anderson.

The Last Sermon at St. Paul's.

Canon Liddon preached his last sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral on the third Sunday after Easter this year, his text being, "Who went about doing good;" and his subject was philanthropy, of which he declared John Howard the most conspicuous example of modern days. Dwelling on the rigid unity of purpose which distinguished him, making his journals monotonous, and, from a literary point, uninteresting, he said:—

> "It was, however, the secret of his success, by which he had revolutionized the prison system, not only of England but of Europe, so that punishments were universally recognised as remedial as well as penal throughout the civilised world. The absence in our day of concentration of thought and effort is the reason why promising lives, bright thoughts, and good resolves lead to little or nothing. The dissipation of intellect was greater than a hundred years ago, owing to the facilities of travel, the number of books and papers, and men, through their breadth of interest and various occupations, do not accomplish one-twentieth part of what John Howard did. Let young men and women, whatever they take up, devote their whole heart to it, whether it be the most unshowy or unromantic way of doing good, such as helping in a night school, setting on foot a Sunday breakfast, or keeping the accounts of a charity, and they might in the eyes of the Infinite Mercy be doing better service than by disposing of immense resources, of being great teachers and rulers in the Church, if only, by unity of purpose, springing from disinterestedness, they laid at the feet of the greatest philanthropist their hearts' truest affections and noblest efforts."

Lady Salisbury and Miss Alderson heard the last sermon at St. Paul's, subsequently having tea with the Canon, and it is said that the former pressed on him

the acceptance of the Bishopric of St. Alban's, where he would have become her Bishop, but he felt that his life of Dr. Pusey was his first duty, in addition to which his health was not equal to the work of a bishopric, whatever might have been the case had he been offered one earlier.

Return to Oxford.

The Canon on leaving London for Oxford in May resumed his usual literary and other avocations. On Whit Sunday he preached in the University Church to an overwhelming congregation, filling every nook and corner of the building, while multitudes were unable to obtain admission. Nearly every one of note in the University, of all shades of religious and political opinion, were present, from the Vice-Chancellor to the youngest undergraduate. The Master of Balliol and the Rev. C. Gore, Professors Ince and Bright, and a multitude of men of light and leading of all occupations, with devout women, not a few, listened to a sermon which, though not referring by name to "Lux Mundi," was really on the subjects dealt with in that celebrated work.

The Great Reception at Cambridge.

The last public act of the Canon's life singularly enough was enacted not on the banks of the Isis or the Thames, but on those of the Cam. It was a sight never to be forgotten when the eloquent Canon walked up the Senate House at Cambridge, in June, to receive the honorary degree of LL.D. side by side with the Master of Balliol. The Vice-Chancellor conferred the degree on both with considerable unction; the cheers of the undergraduates and the ladies were loud and long; the Public Orator in the very happiest terms described the merits of the two great scholars, alike in conspicuous ability and wide influence, but as far as the poles asunder in their opinions. The daughter of an Oxford don who knew both observed, "How ill Liddon looks, while Jowett is the picture of robust health." "Aye," said her friend, "one does not know what care means; the other is always worrying, not about himself, but about others." Canon Liddon returned to Oxford, and was not very well when he went to Highclere to attend the funeral of the Earl of Carnarvon, for whom he had a great friendship, when he caught a severe cold. He has suffered intensely ever since from neuralgic gout, which seems at last to have touched his heart.

The "Dead March in Saul" was played at the close of the afternoon service on Tuesday in St. Paul's Cathedral, Canon Scott-Holland being present. Mrs. Ambrose, Canon Liddon's sister, and Miss Ambrose arrived yesterday from the Continent.

The Rev. G. I. Wallis, M.A., rector of Shobrooke, Devon, died on Sunday after a long and painful illness. Deceased graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1844, and was ordained in 1847 to the curacy of St. Andrew, Auckland. In 1860 he became vicar of Barnstaple. The *Western Morning News* says that while resident in the borough he took an active interest in the welfare of the town, and was a prominent member of various public bodies. During his incumbency the parish church was partially restored, the work being completed a few years later by his successor, Archdeacon Seymour. Deceased was presented to Shobrooke in 1877.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." September, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

This is a "Reminiscences" number, and we think most will take the last paper first; to wit, Mr. A. W. Hutton's of Cardinal Newman. We fear they will be disappointed. Mr. Hutton remembers mainly external matters, and we cannot think altogether correctly. We cannot think that "of recent criticism of the Greek Testament he (Cardinal Newman) knew nothing," nor that "he had never so much as heard of recent theories, such as that about the post captivity date of the detailed Mosaic law." We are not so much surprised to hear that he knew no Hebrew (if Mr. Hutton is correct) and no German, but we are very much surprised to hear and indeed wholly disbelieve that "indolence and a sort of contempt for the congregation he had to address were partly responsible for" the ineffectiveness of his spoken sermons. Mr. Hutton may remember "his rushing up to the library a few minutes before he had to be in the pulpit—in fact, while the *Gloria in Excelsis* was being sung;" but how does he know that it was "to find something to talk about?" The other reminiscences, of music, of coaching boys for Latin plays, &c., are interesting but trivial.

From this we turn to Dr. Andrew Harper's paper on Professor Elmslie, a paper which we enjoyed very much. There we read something about the man, not, as in Mr. Hutton's paper, about his trifling habits. We read with much interest Professor Elmslie's opinions on the attitude of the working classes towards the Church. Like every thoughtful man, he saw and was pained by their hostility. His solution was, "if the Christian Churches would show themselves more Christ-like and would help to force the State into a Christian mould, there would be no reconciliation to make." Quite true, and going to the root of the matter; but we would add that the Church of England must alter the wooden unadaptableness of her services, stiff and obsoletely phrased, to something more applicable to the wants and language of the present day before she can make much real progress.

Professor Cheyne writes of Psalm lxviii. as though it were no more than a poet's song; we do not say he sees in it no more, but he expresses no more. Dr. Dykes' sermon on "The Light of the World" hardly rises above the average of the pulpit. Professor Bruce continues his exposition of the "Hebrews," and Professor Beet his papers on "Eternal Punishment." This last we have not read, being utterly sick of the subject.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

Sir,—Will you allow me to make a few remarks on Mr. Sandland's letter on Confirmation? Our Catechism lays down, as I understand it, not that there are only two Sacraments, but that there are only two as generally necessary to salvation. This appears confirmed by the terms of our 25th Article, which does

not deny that Confirmation, Orders, and Marriage, being states of life allowed in the Scriptures, are Sacraments, or at least Sacramental. It denies only that they have "like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper," and gives reason for the distinction.

Your esteemed correspondent evidently questions what some Diocesan Inspector suggested concerning the grace of Confirmation, because he thinks it tends to substitute works for faith as means of grace. I cannot read the Inspector's suggestion thus. What confirmees do is to re-subscribe their Baptismal covenant. If grace comes at Baptism, which of course I believe, and I suppose Mr. Sandland's believes also, is it not perfectly analogous that more grace should come at Confirmation? Take the case of an adult who is baptised. Is the notion of salvation by works to be suggested here, because he, unlike the infant, who is passive, is active in the reception of the Sacrament?

I do not suppose that Mr. Sandland's intends to advance, that Confirmation, being part of the Apostolic order, sanctioned though not prescribed by the Scriptures, is not a means of grace. It would, however, be more satisfactory were he more distinct. Not that I want a definition of *grace*. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation" is surely definite enough.

Further, I am unable to accept your correspondent's explanation of the difference between Romanism and the Protestant doctrine on faith and works. He seems to suggest that Romish teaching on this subject is the most in accord with reason. I am on the contrary of opinion—and I am not singular—that no doctrine of our religion is more entirely reasonable than justification by faith. St. Paul expounds it with a wealth of reason, surpassing, at immeasurable distance, all the reasoning in all the decrees of the Council of Trent. The estimate that your correspondent makes of Cardinal Newman agrees with the above, and is I think equally erroneous. That eminent person, instead of being guided by reason, was I think guided by faith of an inferior kind and towards an inferior object; and was the author of a number of books, of some qualities that are no doubt admirable, but as destitute of reasoning as it is possible for clever writing to be. I do regret to witness Mr. Sandland's, and others too, in face of the high value ascribed both by men's common sense, and by the Bible, to reason, willing and almost anxious to make a present of that gift to the opponents of Scripture truth.

If I offer criticism thought to be too condemnatory of Cardinal Newman, let me justify myself. One of the most popular of religious poems in our language is his "Lead kindly light." It is good poetry, I must not deny; although a hymn, addressed, as we learn from its history, primarily to a lighthouse that gave very bad light, embodies a curious conception. Now, the principal sentiment of this poem is, that its author loved darkness rather than light, as he tells us in about as plain words as verse admits of. And this is the man who is held out as having exalted reason above faith.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

8th September, 1890.

CARDINAL NEWMAN: AN UNSOLVED PROBLEM.

SIR,—On the Feast of St. John the Baptist, 1836, John Henry Newman published No. 75 of the "Tracts of the Times." Its avowed object was to call the attention of Anglicans to the services of the Breviary. He wrote to claim "whatever was good and true" in those services "for the Church Catholic in opposition to the Romish Church." The latter "has appropriated treasure which was as much ours as theirs." The tract accordingly proceeds with what the writer calls "an act of reappropriation," and gives services in English mainly compiled from their Breviary, ending with a commemorative service for March 21st in honour of Bishop Ken after the same pattern. Of the latter I have given an account in Vol. II., pp. 268-271, of my "Life" of the Bishop.

But the most remarkable of the services is that which stands first in order, with the heading "Service for Sunday, June 21st, 1801. Fourth Sunday after Pentecost." It extends over sixty pages, gives Psalms, Lessons, antiphons, and hymns, as they are found in the Breviary. Many of the translations of the latter are of great beauty. The question to which I desire to find an answer is briefly this: Why did the Cardinal choose that precise day and year? I wrote to ask him when I was writing my "Life of Ken," and he said that he had probably been led to fix on the year because it was that of his birth, but was unable to account for his choice of the day.

Can any readers of the PULPIT help me? Was June 21st in any way memorable in connection with Cardinal Newman's life? Was he baptized on that day?—his birthday was on February 21st—and, if so, was he drawn to its teaching as setting forth what seemed to him the ideal of his vocation? Did its lessons (Sam. xvii. 1-16, with a sermon of St. Augustine's on the history), which, as in the Breviary, chiefly tell of David's warfare against the Philistines, seem to him to shadow forth what was then the dominant idea of his mind, that he had a work to do as the champion of the true Israel against the Philistines of Liberalism and Erastianism, that he was called to defend the ark of God against the enemies who were attacking it?

The infinite pathos of the poems in the *Lyra Apostolica* on "The Call of David" and "David and Jonathan" shows how ready his mind was to realise, and find parallels to, that history. I embodied this suggestion in a note in my "Life of Ken," and sent the book to him, but he made no comment.

Another question is suggested by a passage in Mr. Wilfrid Meynell's able and suggestive article on Cardinal Newman in the *Contemporary Review* for September:—

"Philip Pusey, the member of Parliament, told his brother Edward that one of Newman's greatest triumphs was his 'getting hold of the *Quarterly*.' A little later this complacency must have been shaken by the report that Murray had said he would have given a thousand pounds to be able to suppress the article referred to" (p. 319).

In what number of the *Quarterly* did the article thus referred to appear, and who wrote it?

Mr. Meynell's article, however, written as it is, from the Roman Catholic standpoint, suggests thoughts as well as questions. He is the first to call attention to the fact that the flood of praise, reverence, and admiration which has poured in from all quarters within the Church of England and outside it since Cardinal Newman's death was in fact, as by the strange "irony of history," the triumph of that "liberalism in religion" which he most dreaded. Dogmatic differences embodied in Anglican formularies and Protestant traditions have sunk into the background as compared

with the unworldliness, the saintliness, the genius which all could recognise and value. So indeed it was. The *Zietgeist*—or shall we say the teaching of a higher spirit?—has been mightier than the strong purpose with which the man, whom we now delight to honour, devoted himself to his self-imposed mission of crushing it. And it was so not with his work only, but with the man himself. In the calmness of his recent life, in the absence of the incisive vehemence which marked his utterances in his later Anglican and his earlier Roman years, in the revival of affectionate intercourse with the brother whom he had once repudiated, in the maintenance or renewal of old Oxford friendships, in the kindest sympathy, affection extended, till within a few months of his death, to one who, like myself, had never known him except as a hearer of his sermons, *Sturm und Drang* period of his Oxford life, who never met him but once, and that not till 1884, and never came under his personal influence or was identified with his school of thought, we may trace, if I mistake not, the triumph not of liberalism only or chiefly, but of the charity, the love, transcending the limits of dogmatic systems, of which St. Paul sang the praises. He began with something like the zeal of Jehu, as he himself has pourtrayed it, as if half conscious that he was, in part, in danger of being inspired by it. He ended with something of the serenity and large-heartedness of St. John, as we may picture it some twenty years after the Corinthus incident, if, indeed, that incident was ever a fact in his history.

In yet another instance, also, has that "irony of history" shown itself. Dr. Newman left the Church of England because he thought, with the bitterness of despair, that his mission to revive tne catholicity of its temper, its life, its worship, had proved a failure. When he joined the Church of Rome it was with the feeling that it was his mission to show to Anglicans that their position was untenable, to give to the Church of his adoption, in his "Theory of Development," in his "Grammar of Assent," a new groundwork for its "Apologia" to modern thought. What has been the upshot? The catholicity of the Anglican Church has been revived, and with it there has come a fuller life, a truer and more hearty worship. He has left no such mark on the Church of Rome. There, as Mr. Meynell says, "he came only to learn." We, and not that Church, are the heirs of all that is most precious in his life and writings. His hymn, "Lead, kindly Light," is found in wellnigh all English hymn-books, and will be sung by generations yet unborn by all English-speaking peoples. We have been lately told that the Cardinal himself never heard it sung. I do not know that it has appeared in any Roman Catholic hymn-book, even of the Oratory.

E. H. PLUMPTRE.

Deanery, Wells Somerset,
September 5th, 1890.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—I now proceed to deal with the few remaining phrases in Dr. Hobart's book. The phrases, common to the medical writers and to the author of the Third Gospel, are not only few in number, but also exceedingly simple in character. We find just a noun with its qualifying adjective, or a verb with its natural adverb, or a substantive with its dependent genitive—the very simplest form of phrase that can be imagined—nothing special, technical, or professional; for instance, "drops of blood," "deep sleep," "to touch with the finger"—and half of these phrases are without the slightest reference to medical matters, as, for instance, "broiled fish," "to go up higher," etc.

The word ἰκμάς in connection with φύειν (Luke viii. 6), is found in Hippocrates; but Luke did not necessarily derive them from this medical writer, for φύειν (=*to bring forth, to grow;* Sanskrit, *bhu, bhav ânii —existo*) is a very common, indeed indispensable, root-word, and is quite naturally used with ἰκμάς=moisture. This latter word is also not uncommon, being found in *Homer*, *Herodotus*, and *Aristophanes*. Such an expression again, as ἰχθὺς ὀπτός also in Hippocrates, proves nothing and needs no criticism. It is a natural combination of two common and necessary words—such a combination as any writer might make.

A few phrases are found in Galen alone, but they scarcely require comment. Take προσαναβαίνειν ἀνώτερον; the word προσαναβαίνειν occurs more than once in the LXX. (Ex. xix. 23, Joshua, Judges); ἀνώτερον occurs in Lev. xi. 21; the combination seems almost inevitable—whither can one "go up" unless it be "higher"? There is nothing medical about the phrase, and the only medical writer who uses it lived a century after the Third Gospel was written. Then, again, Galen has ἄσιτος διατελεῖν (Acts xxvii. 33—the word τροφὴ occurs in the next verse); but διατελεῖτε is found in Deuteronomy ix. 7, ἄσιτος occurs in Homer; and a very similar phrase τροφὴν σιτούμενοι διατελεῖν is used in 2 Macc. v. 27. "So nearly do some chapters of the *Maccabees* approach to the diction of others, in the *Acts of the Apostles*, that, if it were not for the subject, but little difference could be found between them" (*Grinfield*). There is nothing medical in this, and if there were, the expression is used by Galen alone, long after the date of the Acts.

Once more. Galen has ὁδὸς σωτηρίας as in Acts xvi. 17; but these words are found separately several times in the Third Gospel and the Acts, and also in the LXX.; and in both occur frequently the very similar, almost identical, phrases ὁδὸς ἀληθείας, ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης, ὁδὸς εἰρήνης, etc., so that no argument can be founded on this expression, used by this one late medical writer. Then in Acts xxiii. 15 we find διαγινώσκειν ἀκριβέστερον, and Galen has ἀκριβεστάτη διάγνωσις, but then the similar phrase ἀκριβῶς γινώσκειν in Acts xxiv. 22 (in the comparative ἀκριβέστερον), is used by St. Paul, 1 Thess. v. 2, and occurs also in Herodotus and Demosthenes. There is nothing peculiar to Galen in the phrase, still less is there anything technical or medical. Galen also has λεπίς used in conjunction with ἀποπίπτειν; but here again is just a simple, natural, almost inevitable combination. What can a *scale* do but *fall off?* *Both* λεπίς and ἀποπίπτειν occur (though not together) in the LXX., in Leviticus, etc. Galen also has a sentence about green and dry trees; but the allusion in Luke xxiii. 31 seems rather to be to Ezekiel xx. 47—the preceding verse in Luke being a quotation from another of the *Jewish* prophets, Hosea x. 8; and of course in all these instances of correspondence between Luke and Galen alone, Galen (if either of the two) must have been the borrower, as he belonged to a later generation.

I now come to Galen's phrase τρῆμα βελόνης—this might, perhaps, be useful to Dr. Hobart, if only it could be clearly established. But as I

mentioned in a previous letter (see the PULPIT for March 15), it is a disputed reading, and therefore can prove nothing. It is not to be found in the text of Wetstein, Griesbach, or Wordsworth, and rests chiefly on the authority of Codices B and ℵ, "two of the most untrustworthy copies in existence" (Dean Burgon). Matthiæ well says, "Passages in which the MSS. vary prove nothing." Dr. Hobart, p. 218, makes a good deal of ὀθόνη used with τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς (Acts x. 11). "This strange use of ἀρχαὶ 'the beginnings' for 'the ends' was the technical expression in medical language for the ends of bandages, instead of πέρατα employed in ordinary language. Galen remarks on this use"; but Galen seems to say that this way of speaking was *unusual*, only used by "*some*" persons (τινες). Now, if Dr. Hobart will turn to Genesis ii. 10, he will see that the river of Eden divided itself "into four heads" εἰς τέσσαρας ἀρχὰς—this very phrase, which was thus necessarily familiar to every Jew. Bengel says, ἀρχαὶ= *extremitates*, and Schleusner remarks "ἀρχαὶ haud rarò *extremitates* notare docet Jacobs," etc. τέσσαρες ἀρχαὶ occurs again in Judges ix. 34; while we have ἀρχή in the sense of "corner," or "extremity" in Judges vii. 19 and Ezekiel xlviii. 1. As for ὀθόνη, it occurs in Homer, Meleager, and Galen's contemporary Lucian. Galen alone uses ὀθόνη; Hippocrates writes ὀθόνιον, and this latter word is found in Hosea ii. 9, no less than *four times* in St. John, and also in Aristophanes and Lucian. Moreover, a phrase in the same verse Acts x. 11, "he saw the heaven opened," is certainly a Jewish expression (Ezek. i. 1; cf. Isaiah xxiv. 18; 3 Macc. vi. 18).

What, I ask again, is there distinctively medical here?

Then, with regard to πυρετὸς μέγας, Dr. Hobart says (p. 4), "Galen states that it was usual with the ancient physicians to distinguish fevers by the terms, μέγας and μικρός . . . and accordingly we meet . . . μέγας πυρετός" (in Galen) and . . . σμικρὸς πυρετός (in Aretæus)." Well, it is just possible that here we have a genuine medical phrase, of the very simplest kind, just as we say, a "*mild attack*"—a phrase which, even if originating with the doctors, clearly would not be confined to them, but would soon pass into common speech. If it be a medical phrase, it certainly is one, the utterance of which neither needs nor implies professional training. The writer of the Third Gospel, however, uses μέγας as an epithet *twenty-five times*. (In the Apocalypse, which is the most intensely *Jewish* of all the New Testament writings, the epithet μέγας occurs more than *seventy times*.) He speaks in the Gospel, and repeats the same expression in the Acts, of a *great* sign, a *great* earthquake, a *great* fear, a *great* (=loud) voice, and of *great* joy. He also speaks of a *great* supper, a *great* tree, a *great* feast, a *great* famine, a *great* fall; why not, then, of a *great* fever?

The writer of St. Luke's Gospel was, if one may so speak, a word-painter, who used expressive epithets. "St. Luke is a consummate painter in language."—(Bishop Wordsworth.) Bleek, at any rate, understands the word simply to describe the intensity of the fever.

Dr. Hobart (p. 52) also points out that "the use of the plural πυρετοί, peculiar to St. Luke, for a fever, and in the case of one person, is quite medical"; but πυρετοί, "in the plural in the case of one person," is also used by Plato, who speaks in the *Timæus* of τεταρταῖοι πυρετοί = quartan fever, recurring every fourth day.

Dr. Hobart adds: "δυσεντερία, peculiar to St. Luke, besides being a medical term, is often joined with πυρετός by Hippocrates." Dr. Hobart, however, does not give any quotation in which Hippocrates uses the plural πυρετοί with δυσεντερία as here. (Acts xxviii. 8.) As fever is a natural concomitant of dysentery, there is nothing wonderful in finding these two words coupled together. Moreover, as the ancients did not study sanitation, but drank unfiltered water, and doubtless indulged in unripe fruit, dysentery must have been a very common affliction. All this can be no proof of professional medical knowledge or training. In any case, this knowledge (as the phrase occurs *only* in Hippocrates) had been public property for 500 years before it could have been impressed on the consciousness of the writer of the Acts.

I have now dealt pretty exhaustively with the words and phrases on which Dr. Hobart relies for the proof of his case. I have shown how thoroughly they are found wanting, when weighed in the balance of a searching criticism. Until the critic thoroughly examines into the whole matter, Dr. Hobart's theory seems very plausible, and his proofs and coincidences appear not only impressive, but convincing, and indeed quite overwhelming. As, however, the process of analysis and dissection, of questioning and comparing, is carried on, these proofs become "small by degrees and beautifully less," until *if* they do not reach the vanishing point, they at least become of no more account than Euclid's point, "which hath no parts and no magnitude"—they no more support the theory of medical authorship than an inverted pyramid can rest securely on its apex.

H. HEBER EVANS.

August 9th, 1890.

THE Rev. A. G. Tweedie, vicar of Selby, writes to say that, as some of the visitors to the Church Congress at Hull, may desire to avail themselves of the opportunity of visiting "the only complete monastic church now remaining in Yorkshire," he will offer every facility for this purpose, and will extend the hours during which the abbey is open till seven o'clock p.m. during the Congress week. As far as possible the vicar will be in attendance to point out anything of interest and to explain the work of restoration now going on. Miss Mary Collins, of Knaresborough, has just presented £500 towards the restoration of the abbey.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

THE Bishop of Bedford returns to town from Scotland early next week in time for the meetings of the clergy at the approaching Ember season.

ON the 6th inst., the Bishop of Durham paid his first visit to Stanhope as the guest of the Bishop of Richmond, and his lordship was heartily welcomed by the parishioners who had, at the invitation of the Bishop of Richmond, assembled at the rectory.

THE death is announced of the Rev. Clavering M. Lyne, a brother of the Rev. Joseph Leycester Lyne, who is better known as Father Ignatius. Deceased was ordained from Gloucester College in 1879, and served curacies at Biddestone, Wilts, and at Leckhampton and Shirehampton, Gloucestershire. The *Church Review* says that for nearly two years Mr. Lyne had been a great invalid, and, owing to ill-health, was obliged to give up his ministrations in Henbury, where he was much beloved and universally respected.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Armstrong, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Stivichall, Coventry.
Berry, Rev. Thomas Holbeche, Rector of Levisham ; Rector of Skirpenbeck, Yorkshire.
Coghill, Rev. E. A., M.A., Senior Curate of Halesowen ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Southwell, Nottingham.
Farrall, Rev. Lawrence M., Curate of Holbeck, Leeds ; Minor Canon of Chester Cathedral.
Heslop, Rev. Gordon, M.A., Rector of Skirpenbeck ; Rector of Levisham, Yorkshire.
Johnstone, Rev. D. Ewart, B.A., LL.B., Curate-in-Charge of Empingham ; Vicar of Lenten, near Grantham.
Marshall, Rev. R. T., M.A., Minor Canon, Precentor of Winchester Cathedral.
Payton, Rev. James, B.A., Rector of Hopton Wafers, Salop.
Pritchard-Nock, Rev. W., Curate of St. Paul's, Birkenhead ; Vicar of Longdon, Salop.
Richardson, Rev. A. J., M.A., Rector of East Blachington ; Rural Dean of Pevensey, Div. II.
Southern, Rev. J. W., Curate of Cleobury Mortimer, and Chaplain of the Union ; Vicar of Charing-heath, Kent.
Ward, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Little Tew ; Rector of Salford, Chipping Norton.
Willson, Rev. Vere F., M.A., Rector of Fulbeck, Grantham ; Organising Secretary to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for the Diocese of Southwell.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blennerhassett, Rev. John, at Ryme Intrinsica Rectory, on the 5th inst., aged 87.
Henslowe, Rev. William Henry, M.A., for forty-nine years Incumbent of Tottenhill-with-Wermigay, at his residence, Westbrigg Lodge, Wermigay, on the 2nd inst., in his 88th year.
Holdsworth, Rev. George Alexander, B.A., late of Stonehouse, at Perth, on the 2nd inst., aged 65.
Liddon, Rev. Henry Parry, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral, at Weston-super-Mare, on the 9th inst., aged 61.
Maguire, Rev. Robert, D.D., Rector of St. Olave's, Southwark, on the 3rd inst., aged 64.
Martin, Rev. William, formerly Fellow of New College, Oxon, and Vicar of Steeple Morden, at West Buckland, on the 7th inst., aged 59.
Stretton, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Eastville-cum-Midville, at Eastville Vicarage, Boston, Lincolnshire, on the 5th inst., aged 75.
Wake, Rev. Heathcote Allen, Rector of Netteswell, on the 31st ult., aged 68.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

By Rev. W. F. COBB, Assistant Priest.

A Sermon Preached in Substance in Holy Trinity, Winchester, on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1890.

"Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile."—St. John i. 47.

NO better description could be given of the great man, whose recent death has left the Church Militant poorer, than that he was an Israelite indeed, in whose mouth there was no guile. No one can have but a superficial acquaintance with his writings without seeing his steady gaze fixed on the unseen world: he truly lived in the world as not of the world: he saw God, and endured as seeing Him Who is invisible. However, too, his honesty may at one time have been doubted, he now stands forth confessed as a white-souled saint, whose mouth never knew guile, whose hands were clean, and his heart pure. All who call on the name of Jesus, however separated in belief and space, claim an interest in his life and work. He being dead yet speaketh. The facts of his life, it may be taken for granted, are well known. It only needs that we draw from them the teaching they contain. Some lessons will be found peculiarly appropriate just now; some will come in the form of warning, some of exhortation. Let us take the warnings first.

1. One of the most prominent features in the intellectual outfit of Dr. Newman was a powerful imagination. "We are accustomed from our youth up," says Bishop Butler, "to indulge that forward, delusive faculty, ever obtruding beyond its sphere: of some assistance indeed to apprehension, but the author of all error." Certainly from his youth up Newman was under the power of a strong imagination; it "ran out on unknown influences, on magical powers and talismans . . . . he thought life might be a dream, or he an angel, and all this world a deception? his fellow-angels by a playful device concealing themselves from him, and deceiving him with the semblance of a material world." Because Arius had erected a throne in Heaven inferior to the throne of the Eternal, imagination must give it an occupant, and it was assigned to the holy Mother. The Primitive Church with her triumphant zeal, "the self-conquest of her ascetics, the patience of her martyrs, the irresistible determination of her Bishops, the joyous swing of her advance, both exalted and abashed him. *Incessu patuit dea.*" The impression made on his mind by his living acquaintance with the saints of early times was exaggerated by his imagination, until he was unconsciously dominated by the one idea of her exalted beauty standing out in strong relief against the dark background of "active Anglicanism." The defects of the former were not seen: the latent capacities of the latter not allowed for. An ideal Church, which never had an actual existence, in which self-sacrifice, heavenly-mindedness, unbending orthodoxy, and the love of God had an exclusive reign, floated before his mind's eye. This was the Catholic Church, and a Church which differed so widely and so deeply from this stood self-condemned, and must give place to one which showed more clearly the original type. Who will say that the lesson here taught is now needless? It requires no ghost from the grave to point out to us the shortcomings of our Mother Church. The world has been so much with her that she has caught somewhat of the world's spirit. A narrow and intolerant faction has crept into her home and polluted her hearth: the haughty intellect of man has delivered its judgment in such blustering tones that she has at times lost faith in herself. Dust and dirt, spots and wrinkles, have marred the lustrous whiteness of her robes, until men scarce seem able to recognize the form of her who should be fair as the moon and clear as the sun. Hence the temptation to desert her for one who at a distance looks more like the Bride of Christ. This "forward, delusive faculty" of imagination needs to be balanced by a sanctified common sense, by a dutifulness to a benefactor, by a generous hope and a self-sacrificing devotion. Common-sense is needed not less in religious matters than in worldly. It is its office to see facts and to prevent us from tilting at windmills; it teaches us that nothing is perfect on earth, and that it is Quixotic to expect that the world will be perfect, at any rate, in our time; it bids us bear the ills we have rather than fly to others that we know not of. Dutifulness to one who has brought us to Christ, who has been our teacher, and who holds aloft for us the torch of revealed truth, forbids us to desert her for another. A hope that is generous, that looks for what it sees not, and calls things that are not as though they were, and the devotion of a true son to a mother sorely bestead, alike bid us do our duty where we are. "He that appoints the sentinel his room doth license him depart at sound of morning drum." No Church on earth answers to our ideal: all have elements that ill suit the Head: let us see that our imagination does not run wild, and fill us with wanhope and undutifulness. On the other hand, a warning voice comes to us over the angry turmoil of fifty years, bidding us not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax. In a panic Newman's teaching was condemned unheard, charge after

charge was delivered against him, and this too, while, as he said, Lutheranism and Calvinism were formally recognised by the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric. He held certain matters as *de fide*. The English Church repudiated them. He obeyed his conscience, and sorrowfully and lingeringly left her. "There were no converts to Rome till after the condemnation of No. 90." "Many of you," he wrote to a zealous Roman Catholic layman, "say that we are your greatest enemies. We have said so ourselves; so we are, so we shall be, as things stand at present. We are keeping people from you by supplying their wants in our own Church." The warning then given is not yet heeded carefully enough. To prosecute and persecute English Catholics was and is to play into the hands of the Church of Rome.

2. Closely connected with this "forward" imagination, paradoxical as it may seem, was Newman's eagerness for a symmetrical theological system. The imagination conjures up an alluring vision of a theological building accurately measured, rounded off, and finished, where part answers to part, where nothing is superfluous or deficient, and nothing unknown. It destroys the beauty of the image if there are rooms locked up, and tracts of ground in the rear unexplored. Newman would fain have consolidated our theological system, and the ambition was a noble one: he wanted to "catalogue, sort, distribute, select, harmonize and complete" the treasures handed down from the great English divines and left by them in confusion. The same love of symmetry again made him see an exact parallel to Rome, the Anglican Church and Protestants in St. Leo, the Eastern Church and the Monophysites. The same craving for simplicity in theology is to be seen in his arguing the cases of the Roman and English Churches on one ground at a time. Now the field is narrowed down to Antiquity against Catholicity, and now it is settled by an epigram, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*" As the evidence to which faith yields is not a single demonstration, but is cumulative, a hint here, a fact there, a probability at one time, a coincidence at another, all joining to produce surrender, so the questions at issue between the two Churches are not to be settled by one broad principle, but have to be dealt with one by one, and the results added together. True that Roman theology is more systematized than either English or Greek. It has explored, mapped out, and erected its standards on tracts that the others are content to have a partial knowledge of. English theology, for instance, holds the doctrines of an intermediate state, and of the merit of good works. Roman is not content with these doctrines, known in part, and prophesied of in part; it defines them in categorical statements, combines them, and produces as the result the theory of indulgences. St. Thomas's "Summa," and the "Catechism of the Council of Trent" contain a vast amount of valuable teaching: one defect they have in common —they know too much. Father Burke declared to his preceptor after a course of the "Summa," that his faith was gone, it was changed into knowledge. The Gospel of Jesus Christ leaves large tracts unilluminated: if the imagination, too little restrained, urges the reason to explore those regions, it needs a humble submission to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, or it will lose its way, and be swallowed up by the marshes of doubt, or hurled over the precipice of unbelief.

3. A third note of warning is struck by the insufficiency of mere negative teaching to be a lantern to our feet. Newman was brought up in Protestant principles and early imbibed Calvinistic notions. Of the three principles which guided him for the best years of his life before 1845, two were positive and one was negative. The two former lasted him till his death, the latter broke in his hand. They were the necessity and our actual possession of dogma, the Sacramental principle, and opposition to Rome, His reading of English theology was that it rested for one of its bases on justifiable denunciation of Rome. He understood this to be the position taken by Bishop Bull and the great English divines. It seems, however, truer to say that the *Ecclesia Anglicana* merely claimed the right to reform herself and to reject a usurped authority, and has never from the Reformation to the present day formally renounced communion with the great Latin Church. But that Church stands haughtily aloof, demands unconditional surrender, asserts the supremacy of her chief pastor over Christendom as of Divine right, and refuses us communion. What can English Churchmen do, therefore, but wait patiently and pray for that peace and unity which is according to God's will? But a creed which is chiefly negative in its character can make but a poor resistance to the majestic confidence of the assertions of Rome. The majority of seceders to her are from the ranks of those whose early training was Puritan. Newman, for instance, started from Evangelicalism, was early tainted with Calvinism, and being thus compelled to start forth in search of a creed, did not stop till he found rest in Rome. His position as an Anglican was but that of a traveller halting to take breath before resuming his journey, or that of a swimmer struggling to get to land. This is, doubtless, part of the reason why Pusey and Keble stood firm when Newman left them. The lesson to us is obvious. It is that nothing short of a dogmatic faith honestly acted on, and that instilled into us from our earliest days, can resist attacks on the right hand and the left. This is why it is so incumbent on us to maintain by all possible means the Church education of our young. Church teaching in youth gives a firm standing-ground and a sure starting-point. If not given then it has to be found afterwards after weary effort, and with great danger of shipwreck and ruin.

4. It is pleasanter to turn to the direct lessons taught by Newman. And the first and most striking and most important is that of the duty of earnest search for truth. Truth for the Christian is no shadowy spectre haunting the darker chambers of his mind. It is not even an impersonal abstraction, but "the whole web of durable personal influences which he believes to bind together God with man, and man with man through God. It is the ever-retreating horizon of an eternal life." The world seeks for information or knowledge, the Christian for truth, and truth with him is connected with personality, for it radiates forth from Him Who is the Truth. Being a living thing, it touches us at an infinite number of points; it cannot be locked up in a definition, or be confined within the four corners of a syllogism: it can be felt or seen rather than known and explained. Truth is an objective reality without us, whether we know it or not, just as the sun exists when we cannot see him for the clouds. Newman's life was one long prayer for light. "Lead, kindly Light" might describe the one desire of his heart. He now sees God's truth more clearly in that land which he imaged so vividly in his "Dream of Gerontius." "With Thee, O Lord, is the fountain of life, and in Thy light shall we see light." How few have this unquenchable thirst for truth! Ere it can be slaked many lands must be traversed, many dragons slain, and many blows given and received. It involves watchfulness, prayer, perseverance, and undaunted courage, an unwavering faith, and self-sacrificing devotion. Many are called, but few chosen.

> Time's years are many, Eternity one,
> And one is the Infinite;
> The chosen are few, few the deeds well done,
> For scantness is still Heaven's might.

To follow the light, wherever it leads, is Newman's exhortation to us. He was led to Rome—whether rightly or wrongly in his case, who shall dare say; But obedience to God's calls is alike binding on all. "Is it not one's duty," he wrote in 1844, "instead of beginning with criticism, to throw oneself generously into that form of religion which is providentially put before one? Is it right or is it wrong to begin with private judgment? May we not, on the other hand, look for a blessing *through* obedience even to an erroneous system, and a guidance even by means of it out of it? . . . I have always contended that obedience even to an erring conscience was the way to gain light, and that it mattered not where a man began, so that he began on what came to hand and in faith." Yes, in faith. But what is faith? It is not a barren intellectual "assent to that which is credible as credible;" it is not credulity, nor unreason. It is an energy of the soul causing it to commit itself to the unknown on evidence which is real, though not enough to give certitude. The voyage of Columbus in search of America was a real exercise of faith, for it was a real venture. A journey to New York now is no real act of faith whatever, for the evidence for its existence is so great that it produces certitude. That God is a Person and our Father, that God has become Incarnate, that He rose from the dead, that the Lord God is dwelling among men, are facts so astounding, so different to the common facts of every-day life, that it requires faith—not so much to assent to them as facts, but to trust ourselves to their consequences. They mean a life spent in the constant looking for the next world, a life of stern self-discipline, of love for others, of submission to God, and readiness to go forth not knowing whither we are being led. Do thy duty, follow the Christ, and leave the rest to God.

5. One more truth comes "borne with bier and pall." It is the secret of personal influence. Roman and English Catholics and Nonconformists alike have joined in doing honour to the life and memory of John Henry Newman. There may have been in this an element of tardy reparation for past injustice. But it meant far more. It is the universal testimony to the saintliness of the Christian. Surely in this case, if in any, the saying *Vox populi vox Dei* has a legitimate application. The earnestness, the simple sincerity, the humility, the long-suffering patience, the intense devotion which made him what he was have been transparent to the world since he published his famous *Apologia*. There is in it a striking passage in which he says: "From a boy I have been led to consider that my Maker and I, His creature, were the two beings, certainly such, *in rerum naturâ*. . . . It is face to face, *solus cum solo* in all matters between man and his God. He alone creates: He alone has redeemed: before His awful eyes we go in death: in the vision of Him is our eternal beatitude, "Solus cum solo." This points to the wonderful power exercised by Newman over English religion of all sorts. He wielded power because he sought it not, because he was in living touch with the source of all power. If we in our generation are to do good, it can only be by first being good; if we wish to set others alight with Divine fire, we must first be ourselves kindled. In this connection his own words in 1832 seem prophetical. Speaking of the select number who have already disciplined their hearts, he says:—"These perhaps by chance fell in with their destined father in the truth, not at once discerning his real greatness. At first, perhaps, they thought his teaching fanciful, and parts of his conduct extravagant or weak. Years might pass away before such prejudices were entirely removed from their minds; but by degrees they would discern more and more the traces of unearthly majesty about him; they would witness from time to time his trial under the various events of life, and would still find, whether they looked above or below, that he rose higher, and was based deeper than they could ascertain by measurement. Then at length, with astonishment and fear, they

would become aware that Christ's presence was before them, and in the words of Scripture, would glorify God in His servant; and all this while they themselves would be changing into that glorious image which they gazed upon, and be in training to succeed him in its propagation."

Grant him, O Lord, eternal rest, and let light perpetual shine upon him.

THE RELIEF OF DERRY.

By the Rev. R. W. COLQUHOUN, B.A. (Camb.), Curate of Christ Church, Belfast.

Sermon Preached at Christ Church, Belfast, at the 201st Anniversary of the Relief of Derry.

"And Joshua said unto all the people, Behold this stone shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord which He spake unto us: it shall be, therefore, a witness unto you, lest ye deny your God."—Joshua xxiv. 27.

IT is a solemn moment, my brethren, in the history of a community when one who has occupied the place of a trusted leader and guide delivers his parting word, and in fulness of years takes final leave of those who have been committed to his care. It is all the more solemn when the individual in question has so discharged the duties pertaining to his office as to bring honour to himself and confer conspicuous advantages on the community with which he has been connected. The time has come for Joshua to go the way of all the earth. Before him are assembled the tribes of Israel, and to them he addresses his parting charge. He recounts the faithfulness of God; he speaks to them of many mercies vouchsafed to their fathers; and by the memory of God's faithfulness in the past he encourages them to further service. Then a covenant is made, and a great stone is set up by the sanctuary of the Lord. That stone, Joshua says, shall be a witness unto you. It will stand the test of time. It will remain when succeeding generations have passed away. It will continue in ages to come as a monument of God's dealings with His people. "It hath heard all the words of the Lord which He spake unto us: it shall be, therefore, a witness unto you lest you deny your God." It would appear that from the sanctification of the seventh day as the Sabbath, recorded in the second chapter of Genesis, and right onward through the entire course of sacred history God has encouraged His people to persist in the commemoration of important events. This stone erected by Joshua is not the only one of the kind we read of as being set up under somewhat similar circumstances. Jacob erected a stone as a pillar on what had become to him the house of his God. On the occasion of an important deliverance to Israel Samuel set up a stone, calling it by the name of Ebenezer, saying, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us." And here I will call your solemn attention to the fact that in this closing chapter of the Book of Joshua when the past history of Israel is summarised, the deliverance in each case is traced directly up to Jehovah Himself. He it was who multiplied the seed of Abraham, who plagued Egypt, who brought the people through the Red Sea, and finally placed them in the land of Canaan. Here we have brought before us a great fact, often, I fear, overlooked by us—namely, the hand of God in history. When we read the words contained in this chapter, "I brought your fathers out of Egypt," we realise that God granted salvation to His people and achieved for them a mighty deliverance. But if we reverse the situation we have another truth of equal importance. "I plagued Egypt according to that which I did among them." Thus we are told in unmistakable language that not only does God prosper His people's work, but that He punishes their enemies for their sake. Upon this I believe the true interpretation of history depends, and Christ gave that interpretation to the course of human events when He said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

If I rightly understand, my brethren, the motive which has brought you together into this house of God this afternoon it is in order that you, too, year by year may erect a memorial commemorative of Divine deliverances lest you should forget your God. This object can only be successfully carried out in so far as we come together in the right spirit for such a service. The right spirit, as I understand it, is the spirit of gratitude to Almighty God; it is the spirit which sends you to this house filled with thanksgiving because of what God has done. The wrong spirit is the one that prompts you to commemoration without a shadow of devotion, and leads you to connect the outward form of religious observance with events in which an irreligious man can have only a very secondary interest, if any real interest at all. My brother Apprentice Boys, in seeking to perpetuate the memory of the men who two centuries ago faced starvation and death rather than surrender their rights as Protestants, you are carrying out a noble intention. Other nations have taught us by their example to keep unsullied the memory of the men who sacrificed their lives upon the common altar of their country. Why should not we, who owe so much to deeds of chivalry, keep the memory ever green of the men whose very names send a thrill of thankful gratitude through the heart of every Ulster Protestant? Can others tell of a heroic past and of suffering for the sake of conscience and of God? We, too, in Ireland have had our noble army of martyrs, and we point to that long agony of living death endured by men and women of heroic mould, whose names shall be kept in the nation's remembrance so long as Protestantism itself remains. Shame be upon the Protestant inhabitants of Ulster if ever there should come a

day in their history when they cease to remember the deeds of old, and glory in the traditions of the past. And if there are those who blame us for our service here, let me remind them that whatever religious privileges we enjoy, whether it be of public worship or of an open Bible, are due to those brave men who knew well from experience the meaning of hunger, starvation, and death, but knew no yielding to that word, "surrender." But we do not come here in any spirit of hero worship, or to glory in deeds done by any arm of flesh. No human power ever achieved the victory that has carried the name and fame of Derry to every quarter of the globe. The victory which we commemorate was never brought about by the starving fugitives within a weak wall, manned by a few old guns. It was wrought by the same Power that brought deliverance to the people of God in every age; and we who are now enjoying the privileges purchased by our fathers at such immense cost can truly say, "The Lord hath done marvellous things. His right hand and His holy arm have gotten Him the victory."

On an occasion such as this it becomes us, I believe, not merely to keep in view the events connected with the historic past, but to take counsel regarding the present and the future. Two centuries have run their course since the men of Derry fought and gained the battle of their country's freedom, and to us who are now alive there come the ever-increasing responsibility of life itself, and of all that is implied in the plain meaning of that word duty. If the past was full of dangers, so is also the present. If our fathers were called upon to defend the interests handed down to them, are not we called upon to do the same? Our special interests, be it remembered, are largely, if not altogether, religious interests. Take from us our inheritance as Protestants and what have we left to us that is worth contending for? Now, the direct dangers of the century succeeding the Reformation were largely made up of the intrigues of the Papacy. Rome boasts that she never changes, and yet the Rome of the seventeenth century is not the Rome of the nineteenth. She has been compelled to modify her policy and withdraw her claims. The Pope of the seventeenth century was one of the greatest earthly powers; his successor to-day is a prisoner in the Vatican. There are some Protestants who live in constant dread of Popish ascendency. I wish to say to you that I do not share their views, and I am prepared to prove to your satisfaction that such fears are groundless. No one knows better than intelligent Romanists themselves that the whole system is rapidly becoming effete. The true antidote to Romanism is an open Bible, and wherever the Word of God is read the religion of Rome is bound to give way. Let us for a moment face this question of supposed Romish aggression, and we will find that in no part of the world does Romanism hold its own in proportion to the increase of the population. Surely if the Roman Church is capable of exercising that beneficent influence over the destinies of humanity that its advocates here would have us believe the people of Italy are, of all others, the people best calculated to appreciate its operations. For centuries the Italian people have been under the sway of Rome. They have drunk from the fountain head of the entire Papal system. And what is the answer that Italy gives to the inquiry as to the real value of the Roman Church? Why, they can point you to their actions. The Italians have thrown off the yoke of the Pope's temporal power, and at the present moment the man most hated in the so-called "Eternal City" is the Pope himself. And this Italy, so long the victim of cruelty, darkness, and oppression, is now stretching out her hands to grasp a pure evangelical faith. So rapid has been the change in the condition of the Italian people that recent accounts tell us of whole districts being ablaze with Gospel light. The Roman Church has for a lengthened period cast a jealous eye on the people of England. What success has attended her efforts in this direction? They have been costly efforts. They have involved the outlay of hundreds of thousands of pounds in the building of churches, the founding of nunneries, and in the support of institutions. The result I lead you to infer from recent statistics. Out of the hundred million of English-speaking people only one-seventh are members of the Church of Rome; and in the United Kingdom alone, while Romanists at the beginning of this century numbered one-third of the population, now they are only one-seventh. In America the decline of Roman influence is even more marked than in the United Kingdom, for in a single decade, between the years 1863 and 1873, it declined twenty per cent. These are hard, undeniable facts furnished on the highest authority, and uncontradicted by Romanists themselves. They prove that Romanism is waning in the presence of an enlightened Protestantism, and that with the increase of Gospel light the entire system must gradually vanish away. Rome has had her day. She used the power once placed in her hands to the best of her ability. By extermination, by persecution, by rack and flame, she has sought to extend her influence and force mankind to become her subjects and her slaves. The result is manifest to us to-day. Men made in the image of God, and gifted with the power to think and act for themselves, will not become the creatures of an intolerant power. We glory in the liberty that makes us free. Rome knows nothing of freedom; she quenches intellect; she stifles thought; she says to one and all of her subjects, "Cease to think and cease to act; allow the Church to become your teacher"; and the Church, placed thus in a position of authority, has been proved, times with-

out number, to be the most corrupt institution that has ever survived repeated exposure. Cardinal Manning many years ago spoke of the English people as an inflexible race. His words have been proved, for him unfortunately, only too true; still the secret of resistance to Rome's claims does not merely lie in the strong will of a nation, but in the fact that the Word of God becomes the rule of life and the foundation of a nation's laws.

And yet, my friends, while I dismiss as unworthy of further serious consideration the claims of Romanism, I am forced to confess that our usefulness is impaired at almost every step by the want of union in the Protestant ranks, and the multiplicity of Protestant sects. I cannot, therefore, forbear speaking to you on the question of the Church's broken unity. Some there are who will say leave matters as they are, and make no attempt to effect a change; others are ever ready with withering sarcasm to lend their aid to the magnifying of differences, and the increase of hostility between the members of the Protestant Churches. With such I, for my part, can have no sympathy. I am decidedly of opinion that he who is possessed of the true spirit of the Master Himself will seek by prayer and earnest effort to draw closer and closer together the living members of the Body of Jesus Christ. Moreover, in view of the world's evangelisation, the pressing needs of the times point to the necessity for unity and comprehension. To-day there is opened out to the Christian Church such a field for missionary enterprise as has never hitherto been known in the history of Christianity. And if I interpret aright the motive which inspires the devoted men in different sections of the Church who are concentrating their efforts on mission work abroad, I believe that the longing desire of their hearts is not the petty ambition of spreading their own particular denomination, but the one that is infinitely nobler of bringing the Gospel of the one Saviour to the hearts and homes of those who up to the present are in darkness and the shadow of death. I need not remind you of the painful cry that reaches us from every distant territory of the danger arising from our unhappy divisions. To us at home the difficulty of the situation is too well known to require any comment. Can anything be done to consolidate the forces of Protestantism, and make our service for God in the world more useful and more effective? I am addressing this afternoon members of the various Protestant denominations. I have no right to demand from you the concession of any claims which you may regard as sacred, nor can you require such from me, but permit me to say, that the doctrinal differences of opinion—the differences from an ecclesiastical standpoint—on matters pertaining to the government of the Church are all as nothing compared to the great principles which are held in common, and on which we are all heartily united and agreed. We have one Bible; we have one code of interpretation; we are united on the great essential points that mark the faith that is truly catholic and apostolic; we cling as one man to the great Reformation truths handed down to us from the stake of the martyrs, and, above all, we are firmly united in the belief that no sacerdotal claims should be permitted to come between the soul and its Saviour. These essential truths mark a common heritage in the faith of Protestants to which all other considerations seem to me of very minor importance indeed. I, therefore, venture to say that I do not regard the difficulties in the way of a visible Protestant union as insurmountable, or capable of continuing to make that union impossible. On the contrary, the yearning for the reunion of a distracted and divided Christendom has marked the increase of spirituality among all branches of the Church of Christ. As to the grounds on which this reunion is to be promoted, I know of nothing so well calculated to lay the foundation for future negotiations as the authoritative declaration of the bishops of the Anglican Church at the late Lambeth Conference. This proposal is so wide as to admit of unity with all Christians who cling to Holy Scripture as the ultimate standard of faith, who accept the two great creeds of the early Church as the statement of faith, and who acknowledge the two sacraments ordained by Christ, and the historic episcopate adapted to local needs. It is also drawn up in a liberal spirit. No mention is made of forms of worship, or of minor details in church order. The response from many quarters at home and abroad has been deeply encouraging. I see no reason why it should not become universal, and thus prepare the way for aggressive action on the part of a universal Protestant Church. Meantime, brethren, let me commend to you all that is implied in the word toleration—a word frequently used; often, I fear, misunderstood. Carry this toleration into every department of your religious life. Rise above the narrow spirit that is ever seeking to promote discord and petty strife by enforcing party claims and repudiating the right of others to think and act for themselves on point that are non-essential to true religious belief.

The distance from the world of religious thought to that of everyday life is not great, and turning to that in which we are all interested as practical workers, I think I may say that the days in which we live seem burdened with anxious cares. It must be apparent to all who study the signs of the times that the relations between capital and labour are in many quarters rapidly becoming strained, and that there is a manifest spirit of discontent and dissatisfaction abroad which must ultimately endanger in no small degree the prospects of trade and industry. I am not, I think, exaggerating the situation when, speaking as an outsider, I say that the outlook in the world of work and labour is far from reassuring,

and that there must shortly be a change in the relations between master and employed if trade and commerce are to continue to hold out to capitalists that reasonable security which they have a perfect right to demand. The only solution of this great question, so far as I can understand it, will be by employer and employed coming to the distinct understanding that their interests are united and identical, and that the well-being of one class can only be secured by the co-operation and sympathy of the other. Furthermore, may we not learn a lesson from the foreign policy of civilised nations, and the increasing desire for arbitration instead of the disastrous consequences attending a ruinous war. Why should not the representatives of the vested trade interests of this and other countries seek the redress of their grievances by mutual concession, if need be, and yield to the decisions of impartial, though friendly, judges, rather than rush to the extreme measures which can only have the one effect of paralysing trade and diverting future business into other channels? I plead for moderation and for peace. Do not, therefore, misunderstand me when I say that, whatever prosperity this city has attained has been owing to the enterprise and public spirit of the Belfast merchants of a generation that is now, alas, rapidly passing away. They were the individuals who fifty years ago solved the Irish difficulty in the only way it ever can be solved, by enforcing that patriotism which teaches men that the true way to foster national interests is by following the principles of industry and peace. They have raised this city to a position that is altogether unique in our country's history. They have contended with difficulties which, to men of less enterprise and determination, would have been altogether insurmountable. Without the natural advantages common to England and Scotland, Belfast has held its own against the continued progress of the sister kingdom, and has advanced to a foremost position in the ranks of towns that show prosperity in every single department of industry and honest labour. Your port is the third in importance in the United Kingdom; your ships are admittedly the finest afloat; your manufactures have made for themselves a reputation which has secured for your city the linen trade of the world. I yield a hearty tribute to the skilled labour of the artisan population of Belfast. But to what is this uninterrupted prosperity due? Is it not to the fact that you are Protestant and loyal, and that as the descendants of the men of 1688 and 1690 you have inherited their inflexible will and the spirit of steady perseverance in the path of duty?

I am addressing this afternoon a large body of young men who are rapidly approaching manhood, and upon whose shoulders there will shortly devolve in a large measure the responsibility for the continuance of the practice of that spirit of industrious worth which has advanced Belfast to its present exalted position. Would that any words of mine could stimulate you to increased activity in those pursuits which you intend to make the business of your lives. You are living in an age which is altogether peculiar, and you are surrounded by advantages of which your fathers knew comparatively little. The whole world of literary thought has been brought within your reach; books on every conceivable subject can be obtained from your public library and literary institutes; the opportunity for scientific research and investigation is also brought to your very doors, and if you are not well qualified to take part in the higher branches of skilled professional labour the fault must rest with yourselves. I urge upon you, therefore, the necessity of devoting your early years to the acquirement of knowledge, in order that you may in after life secure for yourselves positions of honour and distinction in your various callings. Remember that you never know of what powers you may be possessed until you have fairly put those powers to the test, and if there is one here inclined to take a low and desponding view of the possibilities of life allow me to point out to you what has already been done in this city by hard and persistent labour. There are around you on every side monuments of perseverance, and of personal triumph over difficulties. A greater future may yet be in store for the Belfast of another age. I seriously commend to you the advice which George Stephenson gave to the young men of his day when he said, "Do as I have done — persevere;" and perseverance with Stephenson meant fifteen years of unremitting labour at his locomotive before he achieved the success with which his name will be for ever identified. Think, moreover, of the trials, the discouragements, the obstacles innumerable, which have beset and hindered the lives of so many men of undoubted genius. Think of Lord Macaulay, at the very height of his parliamentary fame, being compelled to sell his Cambridge medals to supply the common necessaries of life; or of Sir Walter Scott, at fifty-five years of age, when he found himself involved in liabilities amounting to £120,000. Think of the nobility of character and mine of perseverance which he possessed, when he declined to be a party to a composition, or to accept of any discharge, pledging himself to devote his after life to hard labour in order to clear off his debts. One word sums up the history of that noble, that determined, struggle with adversity—"A great part of the debt was satisfied during his life, the balance was paid by his executors." It is the men gifted with such a spirit as this, my brethren, that make up the history of a country. There are commonplace lives all round us—lives that might as well never have been lived for all the good that they have accomplished. There are lives innumerable, I fear, steeped in selfishness, and squandered over interests that have no higher

ambition than the glorification of self. Oh, be yours the higher, the nobler ambition of living for your country's good, and for the benefit of the common society around you. You are surrounded by the adversaries of youth who wage war, and often, alas, successfully, against those who are entering upon the responsibilities of life. You are called upon to do battle with the foes of faith, and wage uncompromising warfare with all that is low and mean in yourselves and others. Guard well, I entreat you, the citadel of your manhood. Never lower your colours or perpetrate an act that would bring disgrace upon the purity of the crimson that distinguishes the Maiden City of Ireland. It is committed to your care and keeping. Shield it, I pray you, from the stains of sin, and from the contaminating influences of degraded and ignoble lives.

'This stone," says Joshua in the words of my text, "shall be a witness unto you lest ye deny your God." I use these words of the Israelitish leader, and in connection with our anniversary service I apply them to stones familiar to some of you. To borrow the figure conveyed by the poetry of inspiration, I would say that all the stones in the walls of Derry are witnesses to you. They have heard the voice of the Lord; they have been consecrated by the tears and by the blood of martyrs; they have heard the groans of dying men and women; they have seen the unflinching faith of those who counted not their lives dear unto them if only they could hand down to you their children and successors the blessings of an unsullied, spotless Protestantism. I do no violence to the sacred text, which tells of other acts of valour, when I apply to the defenders of Derry the words used by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he says that by faith "they quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens." These stones, brethren, these stones shall be a witness unto you lest ye deny your God. But I desire to carry you back to something that is grander and nobler still than even the stone of Joshua or the stones of Derry. I mean the inspiration of the Cross. The common faith which belongs to us as Protestants centres on the person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It was because of the dishonour shown to him both in His one sacrifice for sin and in His mediatorial work that our fathers protested against the darkness and superstition of Rome. Do not rest satisfied with a negative theology, or with an outward adherence to principles, however good and pure these principles may be. I invite you to surrender your lives to the care and keeping of Him who is the supreme object before us in our worship here this afternoon. With all the force, with all the solemnity I can command, I urge upon you, my brothers, the deepest earnestness in matters pertaining to the salvation of your souls. To-day I call upon you to make your calling and election sure. Then when at last earth's anniversaries have come to an end for ever, when the colours you are so justly proud of have mouldered to decay, and when you yourselves, the representatives of the Apprentice Boys of Derry, have joined the great majority on the other side—then to you there will be given an entrance into that inheritance which is "incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away."

THE late Mrs. Hitchman, of Fenton House, Stoke-on-Trent, has bequeathed the sum of £300, free of legacy duty, to the National Society.

IT is stated that the late Mr. Carnegie, of Stronvar, who had given £1,000 to the endowment fund of St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth, bequeathed £10,000 to the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

THROUGH the munificence of Canon Heywood and his family, who have lately given £3,000 towards the endowment of Swinton parish church, the seats will at Michaelmas be declared free and unappropriated.

LORD LILFORD has promised another sum of £1,000 towards the extension fund of St. John's, Atherton. The church was partially rebuilt about eleven years ago, and is now to be completed at a cost of nearly £7,000, about £5,000 of which is promised or subscribed.

AT Little Bytham, Lincolnshire, there has recently been a dispute between the rector (the Rev. Edward Curtis) and his parishioners respecting the position of one of the church ornaments. The rector has just issued a circular, stating that Archdeacon Kaye, who has visited the church, has pronounced that the cross, about which the dispute arose, was now placed in a strictly legal position. The cross, states the rector, was a legal ornament and legally placed, and yet many of the parishioners still kept away from the services. Having proved that he had introduced into the church that which was legal, he would now take the cross out and thus put aside the cause of difference between the parishioners and himself.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1890.

THE EIGHT HOURS QUESTION.

MR. BURNS and the new lights of labour profess to be very well satisfied with the results of the Trades Union Congress. Let us see what those results are. In the first place, it is universally admitted that the Congress had lost any character it had as a deliberative assembly. The poisonous epidemic of Parnellism has taken hold of it, and swept all before it. Clamour, personal abuse, continual disorder, and extravagant language marked throughout the proceedings of the Labour Parliament. Mr. Burns himself was conspicuous as a disorderly interrupter, and his attitude on more than one occasion was more that of a bruiser than a debater. His evident desire to "boss" the Congress was, however, very soon resented, particularly by the sturdy representatives from the north of England, and I am much mistaken if the samples of London Socialism which were on exhibition at Liverpool have not injured their own cause more effectually than any hostile criticism in the public press.

In short, Mr. Burns has driven a wedge into the heart of the Trades Unionists, and has already split the labour movement into two distinct bodies, which in no short time will become hostile camps. This is the most important service which Mr. Burns has done for Labour, and he has done it by the simple plan of forcing the eight hours question as a test upon the Trades Congress.

The result of the vote was an apparent victory for the party who desire to make the eight hours question a parliamentary one. But it was one of those Pyrrhic battles which the wise general always avoids. The Congress passed a resolution in favour of a legislative eight hours day by 181 to 173, but the exceedingly small majority of 8, which intoxicated the Burns section with joy, is just the very confession of weakness which will be taken advantage of by the opponents of the proposal. To make the result still more significant, such a man as Mr. Birtwhistle is found actually resigning his place upon the Parliamentary Committee rather than sanction the entertainment of legislative interference with the hours of labour. This means, that whereas the majority of working men are in unison on the necessity of endeavouring to get shorter hours by their own unaided efforts, and to that end were engaged in a friendly propaganda of the rights of labour, now the action of Mr. Burns has broken up the unity of the trades unions. A minority once beaten at the polls, especially if it be a powerful minority, is not likely to remain inactive, and where the eight hours had before neutrals, it will now have active enemies.

It is obvious that this must be true when once we appreciate how complex the labour world is, and how difficult—nay, rather, how impossible—it is to legislate on a dead level for all sorts and conditions of working men. There was plenty of enthusiasm at the Congress, but very little argument. For facts and figures we have to go to the British Association, where the dry light of scientific inquiry presents us with some of the difficulties which lie in the path of an Eight Hours Act of Parliament. For instance, if miners are to work eight hours, the engine men who let them down and up the pit must of necessity work longer than eight hours. A double set of engine men might be put at each shaft; but these would only work for less time than the men underground. It is obvious this applies to every factory and workshop run by steam, and to nearly every department of labour, as long as society is what it is, and the subdivision of labour remains one of the necessities of modern life. In railroad life the men who work the engine must be at work before the guard; on the road the yardman must be up before the 'bus driver is on the box-seat. Then there are the workers in various trades which are governed by seasons; fishing and agricultural industries alone present enough difficulties to choke off most theorists. In fact, an Eight Hours Bill would have to consist principally of exceptions to the rule.

The general feeling amongst all moderate men of both parties is that Mr. Burns has not by any means advanced the labour movement by his action. The smallness of the Congress majority has destroyed the moral significance of the vote. It would be the best possible argument in the House of Commons against any Bill of the sort. The old Trades Unionists who have won all the solid triumphs of the past twenty years are against the idea of a compulsory curtailment of labour. There is still a large party of economists in the Opposition ranks, and they are not likely to take their views of the labour problem from Mr. Burns and the new lights. Mr. Gladstone has to be reckoned with;

so has Mr. Morley; also Mr. Bradlaugh. The Conservative party, as a whole, is against compulsion in the matter. In fact, with the exception of a few individuals like Mr. C. Graham, the idea has no place in the practical politics of the House of Commous, though it is used by unscrupulous wire-pullers outside as good ground-bait for labourers' votes. The result of the Trades Congress shows that there is a great body of working men opposed to any one drastic law upon the question. I believe the most that Parliament might be persuaded to do would be to try an experiment, perhaps with the miners, but even this would present great difficulties.

Reviews and Notices.

"JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION," by Andrew Bible. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

THE author of this little volume of some 200 pages has set himself to prove that Christ did not die to appease God's wrath or to satisfy His justice, "but to reveal His character." A previous essay on "The Wrath of God" by this same writer was sent by him to certain bishops, professors, and other learned Biblical critics. In the present volume the author very honestly gives the answers and objections received by him from those who could not accept his theories. In this consists the chief attraction of the book, inasmuch as the reader has the great and unusual advantage of "hearing both sides" at one and the same time. At page 76 Mr. Bible says: "Either my critics are right, and, as they affirm, God did will the death of Christ, ordained it, 'had pleasure in it,' resolved that mankind should never be forgiven without it; and, in that case, those who executed His will performed a meritorious act, and Christ's prayer for their forgiveness is incomprehensible; or the putting of Christ to death was the most awful crime that ever was committed, for it was the crucifying of the Lord of glory (1 Cor. ii. 8); and God was not the decreer nor the instigator of the deed, but, on the contrary, viewed it with horror; and Christ's prayer for the forgiveness of the perpetrators is perfectly comprehensible. We must, I say, choose one of those two propositions." Mr. Bible also discusses, very fully, the resurrection of the body, the substitution of Christ, and physical suffering at once the consequence and punishment of sin. The "prize" (Phil. iii. 14), the author considers to be the "resurrection of the body;" it was, he affirms, "the theme and crowning point of the Apostle's teaching." Mr. Bible has had to encounter many unfriendly critics, but he good humouredly holds still to his own ideas and appeals to the Scriptures on every point.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—In the PULPIT of the 6th inst. Mr. Sandlands writes:—"The Church of England teaches that the mean, so far as man is concerned, of salvation is faith. The Church of Rome as distinctly teaches that it is works. Greater distinction it is impossible to make."

I have no leaning whatever to the Church of Rome, but in the interest of truth I think this a great misconception which ought to be set right. Justification by faith and justification by works are both taught in the New Testament. Compare Romans v. 1, "Being justified by faith, let us have peace with God," with James ii. 24, "By works a man is justified, and not only by faith." And not only so, but the teaching of both Old and New Testaments throughout is that judgment is according to works; and though justification by faith is unequivocally and emphatically taught, it is never taught in immediate connection with judgment.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 10th September, 1890.

DR. NEWMAN IN TRACT No. 90 ON PRESENCE AND ITS EFFECTS.

SIR,—As the Cardinal is now dead, it may be well before he is forgotten to state what were his views, when he put forth Tract 90, which caused so much outcry. From what I will state it will be evident that what he then held and taught, and which was cried out as extreme, was only what now would be thought very moderate indeed. When he put forward Tract 90 he quoted in it from a letter of his to Professor Faussett of, he says, "several years since," that is June 22nd, 1838. This then was his deliberate opinion, reprinted after several years. I will show that it was perfectly harmless, and not the least Roman in tone. Nevertheless, it was taken up wrongly; and I doubt not the clamour helped to drive him to Rome. But with that we have nothing to do. A man must be weak, indeed, if he can be driven into heresy by being falsely accused. Newman asks, Letter to Faussett, p. 57, "what we mean by being present? How do we define and measure it? To a blind and deaf man, that only is present which he touches; give him hearing, and the range of things present enlarges; everything is present to him which he hears. Give him at length sight, and the sun may be said to be present to him in the daytime, and myriads of stars by night. The presence then of a thing is a relative word, depending in the popular sense of it, upon the channels of communication between it and him to whom it is present; and thus it is a word of degree." Then he goes on to talk about spirits, as if they do *not* exist in space, which is nonsense. But he adds, "the incarnate Son *does*." He then says that our Lord's Body is spiritual, and afterwards that it is actually a spirit, which is a downright contradiction. He goes on, "It is in some respects truer to say that a thing is present, which is so circumstanced as to act upon us and influence us whether we are sensible of it or not. Now this is what the Church Catholic seems to hold concerning our Lord's presence in the Sacrament, that He then personally and bodily acts upon us in the way an object does which we call present; but how He does so we know not, but that He should do so, though He be millions of miles away, is not more inconceivable than the influence of eyesight is to a blind man. The stars are millions of miles off, yet they impress ideas upon our souls through our sight . . . . As sight for certain purposes annihilates space, so the other

unknown capacities, bodily or spiritual, may annihilate it for other purposes." He then refers to our Lord's being seen by St. Paul, and to the rapidity of that motion, by which, within ten days, He placed our nature at the right hand of God. "In answer then to the question, how Christ comes to us, while remaining on high, I answer just so much as this, that He comes by the agency of the Holy Ghost in, and by, the Sacrament. Locomotion is the means of a material presence ; the Sacrament is the means of His Spiritual Presence. As the faith is the means of our receiving it, so the Holy Ghost is the agent, and the Sacrament is the means of His imparting it ; and therefore we call it a Sacramental Presence. We kneel before the heavenly throne ; and the distance is nothing ; it is as if that throne were the altar close to us." There is here no adoration of anything in our hands, or on the altar. But just what Cosin said, "Christ from heaven reacheth down to us the divine virtue of His flesh."

"Let it be carefully observed," he adds, "that I am not proving or determining anything. I am only showing how it is that certain propositions, which, at first sight, seem contradictions in terms, are not so. I am but pointing out *one* way of reconciling them. If there is but (even) one way assignable, the possibility of reconciling them is removed, and then of course there may be others supposable, though not assignable. It seems, at first sight, a mere idle use of words to say that Christ is really and literally, yet not locally, present in the sacrament ; that He is there given unto us, not in figure, but in truth, and yet is still at the right hand of God. I have wished to remove this seeming impossibility. If it be asked, why attempt to remove it, I answer that I have no wish to do so, if persons will not urge it against the Catholic doctrine. They maintain it is an impossibility, a contradiction in terms, and force a believer in it to say why it should not be so accounted. And then, when he gives a reason, they turn round and accuse him of subtleties, and refinements, and scholastic trifling. Let them but believe and act on the truth that the consecrated bread is Christ's body, as He says, and no officious comment will be attempted by any well-judging man. But when they say 'this cannot be literally true because it is impossible," then they force those who think it is literally true to explain how, according to their notions, it is not impossible. And those who ask such hard questions must put up with hard answers." Newman's explanation, the only one then apparent to him, is that of the sun, absent, yet by effects, present. He then went on to quote the great Irishman, Alexander Knox, though he does not repeat the quotation in Tract 90 ; why, I do not know. Want of room perhaps prevented ; may be that Knox was too strong for him. Mr. Knox says, "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to serve as the external and visible medium through which the disciples of Christ, in all ages, are to expect, through the co-operation of the Eternal Spirit, *the divinely vivifying influences* of His Incarnate Person, and *the ineffable virtues* of His crucifixion and death. The fact being undeniable, that there are, in the evangelic dispensation, such *influences* and such *virtues*, these influences and *virtues* being denominated by our Lord Himself, His flesh, and His blood, we are obliged by the terms of St. Paul, and by the still stronger terms (if that be possible) of our Lord Himself, to identify the internal grace and virtue of the Eucharist with those *quickening, strengthening, and purifying communications*, which are promised to Christians, as proceeding from the Person and death of Christ, through the ever co-operating agency of the Holy Ghost."—Postscript to "Treatise on the Eucharist," p. 192.

All the italics are Newman's. I have thus shown all that Newman held in 1838, and "several years" after. There is nothing here of what he adopted afterwards, a corporal presence, actual contact with our bodies, presence on the altar, adoration, etc. All I have given above is perfectly Scriptural and Protestant. If he was assailed as if it was Popish, and, by that means, driven into real Popish doctrine, that only shows that he was unstable, and perfectly unfit to be a guide to the Church in the Tractarian storm. The *Daily News* is a violent Radical paper ; yet its character of Newman is worth reading, so I give it as follows : "It is a peculiarity of Newman's genius that he could adopt the forms of philosophy and appear to be arguing when he was only asserting. He could put a pious opinion into a syllogism and appear to prove a miracle by mood and figure. But this semblance of precision, though plausible, is deceptive. The magnificence of the rhetoric, the splendour of the diction in the 'Apology,' and the 'Grammar of Assent' cannot blind a really intelligent reader to the poverty of the reasoning employed. The 'Grammar of Assent' has been wickedly nicknamed the art of taking things for granted. From the 'Apology' we learn, on the only authority which could make us believe it, that Dr. Newman's Protestantism was overthrown by a piece of bad Latin and worse logic from St. Augustine."

AN IRISH CHURCHMAN.

BROTHERHOODS.

SIR,—In your issue of September 6th I find a paper on the above subject. I have waited that someone else might deal with this important subject. One thing everyone must agree with is, the absolute truthfulness of the analogy between the scene on the decks of "a good ship ploughing her way," etc., and the present condition of the Church of England. Just as in the one case everyone is arguing, dissuading, fussing, rushing, jostling, and undertaking to do a duty for which "the captain or officer on watch" are alone responsible, and have well-known rules to follow and fit appliances to use, so it is, alas, in the present condition of undiscipline and almost, if not actual, mutiny in the good ship "The Church of England." I only now ask what are the rules and laws and decisions of this Church on the subject of Brotherhoods ; that is to say, "Brotherhoods, lay and clerical, under vows of celibacy, poverty, and obedience," as it is promulgated they are to be? I find, first, that in the 32nd Article of Religion "Of the Marriage of Priests," it is held that "bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God's word either to vow the estate of single life or to abstain from matrimony," etc. I find, second, in the 14th Article, that "Voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety," etc., and these vows are just of this sort. I find, third, in "The Homily against Adultery," at the end, "that all such as feel in themselves a sufficiency through the working of God's spirit to lead a sole and continent life, let them praise God for this gift, and seek all means possible to maintain the same." This, however, has not one word about "vows" or "vowing," in it. The state is solely left between the individual and his Maker, with no right of third parties to inter-

fere, set up. I find, fourth, in the "Homily on Good Works," second part, near end, a strong condemnation of "the state of religion with its three principal points (of vows) of obedience, chastity, and wilful poverty." The saving "of the man overboard" is well provided for by the rules, laws, and agencies provided by the Church as she stands, without the revolution proposed and the indiscipline manifested by the noisy volunteers who "rush for boats, ropes, life-buoys, anything, everything." PHILIP DWYER, A.M.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adkins, Rev. Sydney Stapleton, M.A., LL.B., Licensed to preach within the Diocese of Manchester.
Austin, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Chaplain to the *Penelope*, for service at Ascension.
Baylee, Rev. Samuel St. A., Chaplain to the *Edinburgh*.
Bennett, Rev. Newton Codner, Vicar of Mendham, Norfolk and Suffolk.
Boissier, Rev. George John, Curate of Limber; Rector of Rothwell.
Brabazon, Rev. John, M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Immortalité*.
Buckle, Rev. Wilfrid G., M.A., Vicar of Eye, Herefordshire.
Cautley, Rev. Richard Hutton, M.A., Rector of Westerfield, Suffolk.
Cree, Rev. J. A. B.D., Vicar of Sunningdale; Chaplain to the Senior Sheriff-elect of the City of London, Mr. William Farmer.
Cudmore, Rev. John Francis Edward, M.A., Vicar of Sutton, Lincolnshire.
Down, Rev. W. J., Curate of Dudley Parish Church; Rector of St. Luke's, Dudley.
Godwin, Rev. G. N., Vicar of East Boldre, Hants.
Hombersley, Rev. Arthur, Curate of Normacot, Longton, Staffordshire; Rector of St. Andrew's, Grenada, West Indies.
Isaacson, Rev. James, Rector of Theberton, Suffolk.
Ker-Gray, Rev. Dr. Edward, Incumbent of St. George's Chapel, Albemarle-street; Chaplain to the Under Sheriff-elect of the City of London, Mr. Augutus Harris.
Martin, Rev. Grantley C., M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Liverpool; Vicar of St. Bede's, Liverpool.
Montgomery, Rev. J. C., Curate of Stoke, Guildford; Rector of Shackleford, near Godalming.
Panter, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Chaplain to the *Malabar*.
Payne, Rev. W. La Porte, Rector of All Saints', Birmingham.
Shepherd, Rev. James, Vicar of Askham Bryan; Organising Secretary to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in the Diocese of York.
Slipper, Rev. William Arminc, M.A., Vicar of Saint Gregory, Norwich.
Scott, Rev. H. R., M.A., Curate of Mossley-hill; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools.
Thomas, Rev. D. Rice, M.A., Curate of Springfield; Head Master of Long Marston Grammar-school. Gloucestershire.
Willoughby, Rev. Nesbit E., Vicar of South Muskham, Newark.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bellairs, Rev. Charles, late Rector of Goadby Marwood, at the Limes, Grantham, on the 9th inst., aged 72.
Brownrigg, Rev. M. B., late Canon of Hobart Town Cathedral, at Sydney, N.S.W., on July 30th.
Cantrell, Rev. William Henry, Priest, for twenty-five years Rector of the parish, at Bulwell Rectory, Notts, on the 7th inst., aged 82.
Martin, Rev. William, formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford, and Vicar of Steeple Morden, at West Buckland, on the 7th inst., aged 59.
Millar, Rev. James Ogilvy, LL.D., Rector of Christian Malford, Chippenham, and Honorary Canon of Bristol Cathedral, on the 14th inst., aged 62.
Patterson, Rev. William St. George, Divinity Lecturer and Sub-Chanter of Lichfield Cathedral, at the Close, Lichfield, on the 7th inst., aged 74.
Wallas, Rev. Gilbert Innes, M.A., Rector of Shobrooke, at Shobrooke Rectory, Crediton, on the 7th inst., aged 69.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE LATE CANON LIDDON.

By the Rev. H. SCOTT-HOLLAND, Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday Afternoon, September 14th, 1890.

"Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of Whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God."—Eph. iii. 13-19.

THE strange contrast between the scene open to the outward and to the inward eye! To the outward eye a lonely man in prison—a man broken before his time, and now marked with the pitiful witness of age—a man battered by storm and hardship, by wind and weather—a man of delicate fibre and sensitive nerves, high-strung and passionate, yet bruised by affliction, wounded by disappointment, deserted and forlorn, dogged to his grave by fierce and vindictive hostility. Round him his work is breaking and his friends are falling away, and he is nearing, it would seem, the darkness of death.

So it is with Paul the aged at Rome. And at Ephesus there is a Church, that watches on for the dreaded end: waits and watches, sick with fear. Every day may bring the worst tidings. And men's hearts are full of forebodings. They creep from house to house with quaking steps, disheartened and alarmed. In corners, in hiding-places, they meet in knots, and their eyes are clouded, and their faces are stricken. There are mutterings and whisperings, that pass from one to another, low, ominous, and dismal. Each, as he whispers his fears, deepens his own trouble; and each, as he listens to his own alarm coming back to him in another's forebodings, feels his own distress corroborated and multiplied.

Such blows are threatening the Church! The foes press in on every side. All is menacing. Bad hours draw on apace; evil looms large; already the attack beats at the door; false friends are shrinking; suspicions eat and gnaw within. And at such a moment—so big with fate, so black with disaster—he will be gone who alone could stay the flight, or rally the timid, he who alone could give the high word of command, could master the stress of the storm, could quicken courage and promise hope.

He will be gone! Over him, over his beaten and dead body, the attack will roll on with intensified fury, with a yet louder confidence. Alas! how will they, his children of thefaith, face the event to which he has yielded his life, they, so weak, so nerveless, so impoverished, so incompetent, such babes in knowledge? How will they stand, without a leader? How will they endure, orphaned and beggared?

So they mutter at Ephesus, in the dim corners where they tremblingly gather together, It is a Church that is "faint," for their chief is in tribulation. So it all looks to the outward eye. But how within, to the spiritual eye? Inside the room which is his cell, what does that prisoner see? what is he doing?

He is on his knees, praying for the Church. And the one thing that he desires of God for it is that there should be none of this whispering, this alarm, this foreboding of disaster, this faint-heartedness, this sinking of the spirit, this trembling of the knees. This is the one thing that he cannot tolerate in his children. This is the one irredeemable mistake; this is to misinterpret everything; this is to falsify Christ. Against this he bends himself to protest in prayer, with all the energy of his being: "For this cause I bow my knees;" "I desire that ye faint not at my tribulation, which is your glory." "Their glory!" That is what it means in God's sight. The hour of special tribulation is the very hour in which to look for special glory.

"For this cause I bow my knees." For what cause? They, poor things, are looking only for gathering troubles, for miserable losses, for bitter defeat. They are conscious of nothing wherewith to face the evil but craven hearts, and failing wills, and broken hopes, and demoralised ranks. But what is the experience which he anticipates for them? What does he see ahead of them, in this dread hour that comes on so fast? What does he hope on their behalf during these days of his tribulation? Ah! the wonder of it! As he prays there, bowing his knees--he, that weak, bruised, broken prisoner, battered down to his death by the harsh and cruel disorder of a demoralised world—he looks through into another world where all is ordered and seemly and strong and calm from end to end. There nothing is going wrong; nothing is hindered or disturbed; there is no wild rout, no turmoil, no failure, no fear. To that world he looks, in which his very weakness is changed into strength. For there he is in sure and responsive touch with the Source of all power, the Will that holds in it all dominion. He has hold of that Power by prayer; he, the defenceless and stripped prisoner, can draw, for the Church's behalf, on that supreme force which alone lends force to all that has any capacity to hold itself together or establish itself on earth. He can liberate the Power behind

all powers, the Will that lies behind all wills. So he prays to God, the God after Whom every family in earth is named, to the God of that wide and far-reaching efficacy, Who binds and knits together in one all forms and fashions of human coherence. With Him is no disorder such as they dread, no ruinous undoing of His work. They are afraid lest He should be shattering the bonds that bind His own household, the Church, into one body. But St. Paul looks to see Him revealed as the strong Binder of all bonds of peace; as He Who is ever drawing things together into consistency; as He Who, wherever He shows Himself, gathers and not scatters, builds and not pulls down. Wherever there is a companionship, a brotherhood, a family of men, it is He Who gives it its solidity, Who nourishes it by joints and bands. This is the God and Father Whose unifying energy he looks to see exercised on behalf of this fainting Church. And he appeals to it by a yet dearer title, in the Name of Jesus Christ, in Whom He has put out all this force of coherence, in Whom He has summed up all things, gathered up all men, "even into His Body, Which is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." How will the God Whose very nature it is to bind families in one ever suffer the supreme Body to fall in pieces?

To such a God he appeals. And in the power of this appeal he foresees for these poor Ephesians, through this tribulation which has so terrified them, an upward growth of steady and unwavering increase. Up and up they are to pass, step by step, higher and higher, with delightful and orderly sequence, in regulated and sure progression, lifted flight after flight up the graduated ascensions of this kingdom of law, up which they will pass as they rise out of the lower grounds of penitential deliverance from sin. These they will leave behind them; of these nothing now is to be said. All that drama of the soul's justification, with which the Apostle had so often passionately concerned himself, through which he had wrestled by the side of each suffering spirit as it was torn out of its old bad past, and was violently transplanted into the new hope—all this is now done and over. Each soul is through it. And now the Apostle only sees them climbing clear of the dark valley of shadows, and mounting and mounting ever on and on, in a growing glory of grace upon grace. It is the great riches, abundant and overflowing, of this glory which he now hopes to see them occupying and assimilating. It is "might," with which he foresees them strengthened—"might," Divine "might," which shall displace their faintness and annul their fears—"might," impoured into the sources of their inner life by the incoming, inworking Spirit, Who feeds and fortifies and fires, Who builds and gathers and nourishes, the Spirit of all strength, Who grasps, and binds, and quickens, and concentrates, and sustains, and succours, and transfigures, and consoles.

And still this is not all. Uplifted by the infused might of the Spirit, the Christ in Whom they already are will be made to be also in them. Down He will pass; in He will enter; there He will lodge. Faith will admit Him, and ever again He will enter, and ever He will arrive again, and ever faith will open, and ever all things will become new, and that which was true before will yet become truer and truer. "Christ will dwell in their hearts by faith."

And so a new vitality, a new solidity, will come upon them. They will drive their roots down deep into the encompassing love; they will tie themselves into this steady ground; they will be built as into a rock which no storm will ever shake. And so, "rooted and grounded in love," their faculties will enlarge, will open out, will gain fibre and win amplitude; their range of sight will grow steady. They will look no longer with eyes blurred by fears, but with the eyes of saints; and, lo, on every side, high and low, deep and broad, the eternal lines of the kingdom will start into the light. Far into the vast purpose of God in Christ they will pierce. Clearer and yet clearer its slow mercies will disclose themselves. Cloud after cloud will unroll and disappear, and ever the heights will become more radiant, and ever the depths will grow more luminous. And still the more they see, the more will there be to learn, and still the deeper they enter into the knowledge of Christ's love the vaster will be felt the depths that surpass all their knowledge. So the life will ever grow and the joy ever increase. Love will ever deepen; knowledge will ever rise. And always there will be more. For it is the fulness of God Himself wherewith they are being filled, a fulness that custom can never make familiar nor time ever exhaust. That is what the Apostle anticipates for them. How strangely different from that which they have anticipated for themselves as the issue of their tribulation!

My brethren, why should I dwell on this to-day? You will not for a moment mistake me. I am not presuming to force a parallel between that Apostolic moment of terrible trial and that grief which, in God's natural course, has fallen upon us to-day. Only, somehow, the great words of this epistle have haunted my memory through the depression of these days. Only of one thing I am sure, that he of whom our hearts are full was one of those few, those very few, from whose lips we could bear to hear without an apology such strong and awful words as these which came from the innermost soul of the great Apostle. So few of us have the right to use this great language. From so few can it come without a sense of unfitness, of disqualification, of presumption. We are so blinded by this world's dust and turmoil: we are so clouded by compromise and hesitation; we are so insincere, so unconverted, so earthly; we are so far, far, from these high visions and piercing calls. The burning flames that leap through the speech of St. Paul are

not for us to touch without offence, without peril.

But he! He was different; to him they seemed akin. He understood; he had the right to take them on his tongue. We asked for no apology from him; we murmured under no questioning qualification. As they rang out from his lips (and who ever could make Scripture ring as he did?) their original force seemed to reach and touch us across all the dividing years. No insincerity withheld it. No half-hearted allegiance made them falter in their coming. "The world," with its worries, its disputes, its vanities, its beguilements, its pettiness, its greeds—the world threw no veiling mist between us and those Divine appeals. He who spoke to us had got past all that. He had pushed his way up through all the tangle. He was not afraid of what was involved in facing the truth. He at least was ready for the sacrifice. He had counted the cost. And so, by virtue of that sincerity, of that purged eye, he, we felt, saw something of that vision which the Apostle opens to us. That inner world was real and substantial to him. That fiery zeal had its echo in him. That ever-climbing life of grace upon grace had come within his ken. His life was a cleansed channel down which the news of it might pass to us without derision.

Can there be a better test of the spiritual sincerity of a man than this: that we feel no shock when he speaks to us the Bible language? And was it not this which was the entire secret of Liddon's power over us when he preached? As we listened, that inner world, that lies before the spiritual eye, was once more felt to be laid bare. St. Paul became once more intelligible. Our world, which we collect together under the range of the outward eye—that world in which we creep about, whispering, muttering, nursing a faint hope, struggling to keep our hold on the vision, trembling ever lest it should break and vanish—that world of shifting resolution, and bewildered doubts, and miserable timidities, and haunting hesitations—that world of ours, was parted asunder! It was pierced through and through by that vibrating voice, that shook us as it told of that which lay beyond, as it lighted on us like a flame, to sting and to stir.

Ah! that voice! As I speak of him, as I recall to you his message, standing here in this place, where his presence was so familiar, it is I who should be dumb. It is this silent pulpit which speaks to you! It is he whom we still feel here, he, under whose dear and remembered tones our hearts still tingle and our spirits burn, so that we cannot yet believe that we shall never hear them again! Never, never again! Bitter indeed our tribulation, our orphaned impotence!

But, at least, he has bequeathed to us the solace and the succour of some imperishable memories—memories that you and I shall carry with us to our dying days, uneffaced by all that the coming years may bring us.

To some here, it will be perhaps some memory of St. Mary's, Oxford, crowded with the black mass of gowned men, thick packed in gallery and on floor, the outburst of organ and of hymn, the quick passage of the preacher up the pulpit steps, the low Bidding Prayer with its delicate articulation, and then across our life, our young life, giddy with light gaieties, glittering and bubbling with all the fleet gossip of the changing hours, we shall for ever remember how there shot the voice, alive with passionate insistence, that told of the eternal things that can never fade away!

To others—to most who are here—it will be the memory of the motionless crowd of upturned faces in this great House of God, as the yellow lights flickered and shone through the illuminated haze of some heavy December afternoon, while all the walls were yet tremulous with the lingering music of the service. And they will never forget how up and up there rose higher and higher, filling all the misty hollow of the dome, the piercing tones of that most beautiful of all voices as with kindling figure and flashing eye he "reasoned of righteousness and of temperance and of judgment to come."

Oh! so near it all seems, so real, so living! Let him then so speak, as if alive, to you to-day. It is his message, not mine, that I would deliver to you.

Think only of him: not yet is he quite gone from us; not yet has the grave hidden from our sight that body of his on which the impress of his soul is still vivid, in which and through which he bore his witness to God. Still it lies in our hands for holy tending; still it pledges to us his presence. Oh! while yet it lingers with us, lying calm and still in the very room where he wrote, amid the books which he loved, listen to him while yet once again he pleads with you as an ambassador for God on behalf of Christ, as if God were beseeching you by him! Let this voice be in your ears. For that dumb thing is yet eloquent. For he that is dead yet speaketh.

Surely we know what he would say to us. Surely he, in his unseen prison house, would desire most of all, with the Apostle, that "we should not faint at the tribulation which is his glory;" not faint, not be dismayed, not grow miserable or craven, not tremble in our loneliness. Why are we lonely? Why should we feel deserted? He has but passed into that hidden world of which he ever gave us such glorious report, and which was ever so nigh to him. And surely there, where he is, being the one whom we knew and loved, he is ever still bowing his knees before God, the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, and praying, with all spiritual fervour, that the Church left here on earth behind him may be "strengthened with the might of the Spirit and may be rooted and grounded in love, and that Christ may dwell in our hearts,"

and that we may be enabled to comprehend a little more of that which now he beholds, that we "may see, with all saints, the breadth, and height, and length, and depth, and may know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, and be filled with all the fulness of God." That is still his prayer; that is still the voice wherewith he cries to us out of the dread and solemn silence of death.

And we can answer back. We can remember him in our prayers before God, we who live in the same Body of Christ of which he is still a member, we who partake of the same food, kneeling at our altar, as that by which his life is still fed, and his spirit purified.

In Jesus we are one with Him, in Jesus Who is the living Lord both of this world and of the world beyond the tomb. Pray we then for him, for his refreshment, for his illumination, for his eternal peace; and, so praying, God grant us to be more faithful to that message from God which he, while here among us, so loyally and so unfalteringly delivered.

THE FATHER OF LIGHTS.

By the Rev. JOHN W. KAYE, A.M., Rector.

Sermon Preached in Derrybrusk Parish Church.

"Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow cast by turning."—St. James, i. 17 (Revised Version).

THE Scepticism of the eighteenth century has been followed by what is called the Agnosticism of the nineteenth. This know-nothingism most strangely deifies the so-called laws of nature, but affects to know nothing of Him who spake all nature into being, and imposed the laws of universal existence. It adores creation, but it ignores the Creator. Yet is it not a self-evident truth that the moral nature of man is itself not only a witness for the existence of God, but also for the nature and moral attributes of God? The existence of our own moral feelings, prove to us the existence of certain attributes or moral feelings of God, in whose image we are created. The sense of truth and righteousness within us is the testimony of our nature to the truth and righteousness of God. Thus a truly Christian man not only believes, but inwardly feels, that "God is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him" (Heb. xi-6). Our reason concurs with our experience in bearing witness to this fact.

The more we seek after God in loving obedience, adoration, and spiritual communion, the more will He reveal to us the glory of His person, His character, and His Sovereign Will. We shall behold Him not only reigning in righteousness and true holiness, but hating sin, and yearning with age-long endurance over His erring creatures, and travailing in pain to bring them from rebellion to loyalty, and from darkness to heavenly light. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God" (St. John vii. 7) In God alone is absolute perfection, unchangeable truth, and infinite self-existence. "He is the blessed and only Potentate, the king of kings, and lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light which no man can approach unto" (1 Tim. vi. 16). But God has given us grace in Jesus Christ, who abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light, through the gospel (2 Tim. i. 10).

Light is a necessary condition of true life; hence life and light are co-ordinate; and He who is the source of life, is also the source of light. "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men. That was the true light which lighteth every man coming into the world" (St. John i. 4-9). There is mental and moral, as well as material light, and God is the "Father of lights." He is the great central sun, both of the physical and spiritual universe, from whose brightness proceeds every ray of truth and beauty, and every gleam of life and love. The light which shone upon St. John beamed also upon St. James, giving him a gracious and sublime view of the glory and goodness of God. This glorious Being he describes as "The Father of Lights in whom is no variation, nor shadow cast by turning." In our text this important fact is brought before us concerning the "Father of Lights."

I. He is the Dispenser of all Good.—"Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights." Modern unbelief assumes the inscrutability of that Power we call God; its plea is that it does not deny that there is a God, but it maintains that neither revelation, nature, nor human reason, supply an adequate proof of His existence. On the other hand, believers in God maintain that they find proofs of the divine existence not only in the sacred and eternal truths of Revelation, and in the sublime grandeur of the Universe, but in the nature and necessities of man. The Christian does not believe that all things came by chance, nor yet by blind force; nor that God "is the stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being." For where is the "stream" that has no fountain, or the "tendency" that has no end or fulfilment; and what is the "law of being" that has no purpose and no Personality to direct its mode of operation or order of sequence? St. James cuts at once through all unbelief, and declares not only that God exists, but that He is the source and fountain of all good. Nay more, he assures us that God lives not for Himself alone; but to bless with the choicest blessings the creatures of His love; and that He is the Giver of all good. A multitude of

gifts implies a multitude of recipients; and every man living has received some gift; for life itself is a gift, as much as health and strength, food and raiment, and power of thought. And life is worth living, if we use rightly and well the gifts that we each have obtained. Is there a man in the whole earth, who has no tender touch of love, cannot think a good thought, or wish a kind wish, or lend himself to do a gentle deed? God's gifts come to all, the high, the low, the rich, the poor; there is no monopoly of Heaven's free favours.

"The precious gifts, that soothe, and heal, and bless, are scattered at the foot of man, like flowers." But St. James makes a distinction of gifts; there are "good gifts" and there are "perfect gifts." Good gifts may be neglected or abused and their glory turned into shame; or they may be exercised, developed and perfected to the glory of God, the Giver. There are also degrees of development, in excellence and efficiency, in sweetness and beauty. And all men are responsible to God and to their fellow-men for the right use of the gifts with which they have been endowed.

Again there are benefits, boons, and blessings which God bestows, which are perfect in themselves, and included in these are all His spiritual blessings. But God's greatest and most glorious gift is the gift of His beloved and only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. In Christ Jesus all heavenly gifts and graces are ours; sins forgiven, hearts renewed, righteousness and adoption, honour and immortality, an inheritance incorruptible, and an eternal weight of glory. Oh, that we may realize them now, and enjoy their perfection in the ages to come. But further we are told concerning "the Father of lights," that—

II.—His Perfections are Unchangeable.—"With Whom can be no variation." Mutation is indelibly imprinted on all Nature; everything around us yields to irresistible decay. The seasons come and go; kingdoms, empires, and nations rise and fall; stars revolve through their age-long epochs, their brightness darkens, and they die. But through all the vast infinitude of space, through all the sweeping solitudes of Time, and of eternity, a voice sounds forth in accents of sublimest grandeur saying, "I am the Lord, I change not." The infinitely perfect God cannot change; in His inscrutable essence, in His glorious personality, and in His sovereign will, He is from everlasting to everlasting the same. In Himself he is absolutely immutable. The planetary worlds have their revolutions, declinations, and parallactic changes, but "the Father of Lights," the great central Sun of all creation, knows no variation; "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

The heathens made their gods as changeable as their own ever-varying conceits, as fickle as their capricious moods and fancies; but God declared Himself to be Jehovah, the unchangeable. The immutability of God confirms our faith in His promises; and assures us of the everlasting stability of all His sovereign purposes. He goes not back; He turns not aside; He doeth all things "according to the counsel of His will," and none can say unto Him, what doest Thou? "Before the mountains were brought forth, or even Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting Thou art God." His own Word spake innumerable worlds into being, His own hand adorned them with heavenly radiance, poised them in air, and rolled them through the boundless fields of space.

Deep in the unfathomable abyss of eternity, He "dwelleth in light which no man can approach unto." He speaks His commands throughout Creation's bounds; His pleasure is accomplished; nothing hastens, nothing lingers, nothing fails; past, present, and future are his everlasting, yea.

> "O, Thou Eternal One! whose presence bright
> All space doth occupy, all motion guide
> Unchanged through Time's all devastating flight;
> Thou only God! there is no God beside!"
> (Derzhavin.)

We have yet further considerations before us in our text, concerning "the Father of Lights," for He is not only unchangeable in Himself and in His purposes, but—

III.—His Glory Suffers no Eclipse.—"Neither shadow cast by turning." St. James here continues his allusions to the various movements of the planetary bodies using scientific, astronomical terms. These wandering worlds, with their attendant moons, have their apparent changes of position, direct, stationary, and retrograde; they have their transits, adumbrations and eclipses—"their shadows cast by turning." But on the ineffable radiance of "the Father of lights" no shadow is suffered to fall. Above all heights, in the zenith of His glory, Jehovah reigns, shedding down his light and love upon all; no shadows, no eclipses are there. His glory beams forth in cloudless splendour from the everlasting throne of His righteousness; and the rainbow round about the throne is the circle of eternity. His vision is not dimmed by the shadows of human prejudice or human favour; His light is pure and He beholds us as we are. He knows all our needs, and His gifts alone are "good" and "perfect." And shall man, who cannot sound even the shallows of God's Creation, dare to question the Eternal? Created and dependent man cannot comprehend the glory of the uncreated and self-existent Creator. The ineffable effulgence of the Divine Essence is for ever and eternally the same; nothing can dim its resplendent magnificence, neither can it be increased or diminished. As God is Himself from everlasting to everlasting, His glory must be commensurate with His own eternity, unchangeable and unchanged. "The heavens declare the glory of the Lord and the firmament showeth His handwork," "the whole earth is full of His glory." Star speaketh unto star, sun to sun, and system to system,

telling of the wisdom and majesty of God. Immensity spreads out before us, space extends on space, and firmament on firmament, until we are lost in the everlasting infinitude. "Lord, what is man that Thou art mindful of him or the son of man that Thou visitest him." Cherubim and Seraphim veil their faces within His courts; how then can man intrude into the Holy of Holies and yet live. We can approach no nearer than the threshold of the Temple of the Godhead. "Canst though by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? high as heaven what canst thou do? deeper than hell what canst thou know?" (Job xi. 7.) "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the world upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in His thick clouds; the pillars of heaven tremble, and are astonished at His reproof. Lo, these are parts of His ways; but how little a portion is heard of him? but the thunder of His power who can understand?" (Job xxvi. 7-14). If such be the greatness and glory of God, how deep should be our humility? Yet God's greatness is equalled only by His goodness; bringing light out of darkness, and joy out of sorrow. God's everlasting purposes, and unutterable love to man, are they not all "crystallized into that one word—Redemption." God's everlasting redemption of rebellious and sinful man; what an overwhelming thought. If it was glorious to create, it was much more glorious to redeem; yet God sent forth His Son "to redeem them that were under the law."

Redemption—Salvation—is man's blessedness and God's glory, and in Christ Jesus God's glory shines most gloriously. Who can tell all the bounty of God, the plentitude of His blessing, and the inexhaustible treasures of the riches of His grace. Even beyond the shadows of the grave the visions are glorious. For He will gather His ransomed ones from every people and kindred and nation, to inherit the Kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world. He will lead them on from height to height, from glory to glory; they shall obtain joy and gladness and sorrow, and sighing shall flee away.

THE Rev. Samuel T. Adams, who for several years past has been minister at the Ross Congregational Chapel, has joined the Church of England.

THE Bishop of Chester is taking a new departure by intimating that he will hold his Advent ordination (on St. Thomas's Day) at St. Thomas's Church, Stockport.

THE gross rental of the land bequeathed to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty by the late Mr. E. R. Harris, of Preston, for the benefit of Lancashire livings, is about £700 per annum. This land is to be sold, and the proceeds are to be appropriated to the Lancashire benefices as favourable opportunities occur.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1890.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

A GOOD deal has happened in the last week or two upon the aspect of the labour movement. The Southampton dockers have dotted the "i's" and crossed the "t's" of a good deal of talk of the new trades unionists at the Liverpool Trades Congress, and we had not to wait long for an example of what Messrs. Burns and Co. really mean by a forward policy in trade disputes. It is unnecessary to recapitulate at any length the facts of the Southampton strike. The main features of mob law, brutal violence, and almost civil war will not be easily forgotten by an interested public. The mayor was obliged to call in the aid of the military to save the town from rioters, and blood was shed, though happily without any fatal results. In the end, not only was peace restored, but the strike was brought to a speedy termination. The men struck without counting the cost or the present critical position of the Dockers' Union in London. There is not, it is pretty well known, a plethora of cash in the treasury, and there is just now a brisk whip being carried on for money to send to Australia. Fired by the proceedings of the new unionists at the Congress, the Southampton dockers, at the close of some negotiations on the question of wages, struck work until the Dock Company recognised the Dockers' Union as one of the parties to the dispute. This is one of the central planks in the "new unionism" platform. Employers are to deal, not with their own men direct, but with the organisation to which the men belong, or rather, to men who, like Mr. Burns, boss the union. This demand the Dock Company at Southampton refused, and in the end they won their point with ease.

But the rapid defeat of the men, contrasting remarkably with the success of the London dockers last year, is largely attributable to the changed conditions of capital. Capitalists have been actually driven by the strike epidemic to combine in self-defence. Judging by the events of the past year, and particularly Southampton, the determination of employers to federate in the general interests of trade and freedom has come not a moment too soon. Last week the ship-owning interests of the kingdom registered themselves in one vast association, with the view of dealing with labour questions of all kinds, and particularly of fighting such phases of new trades unionism as cropped up at Southampton. We give the objects of this new federation. They are—"(*a*) To deal with labour questions of all kinds, including conferences with labour organisations. (*b*) Indemnity to ship-owners whose vessels are detained by the authority or in consequence of the measures taken by the federation. (*c*) Legal proceedings where necessary in important test cases within the objects of the association, but not for ordinary breaches of discipline, etc. (*d*) The protection of officers, crews, or servants of ship-owners against intimidation on the part of trades organisations or their members. (*e*) Proposed legislation affecting ship-owners. (*f*) Counteracting the effects of agitations against the shipping interest, and to deal with cases of conspiracy."

It is to be hoped that with this great combination looming up, which by a levy of a penny a ton can realise £50,000 at a moment's notice, the Socialistic section of the labour movement will think twice before precipitating their dupes into labour quarrels. We regret that one of its objects is not to form a volunteer and free labour union in the East End of London. From what we know and hear of the sentiments and opinions of casual dock labourers, who have in former years been glad and content to do the light work of the docks, such as handing parcels or pushing trolleys, for fourpence or fivepence an hour, we believe that such a Union would be eminently successful. It certainly ought to command the sympathies of all consumers and of those who object to be taxed for the support and glorification of Socialist agitators.

Whilst condemning the policy and action of the new trades unionism, it must not be supposed that we do not recognise the right of working men to combine to the fullest extent within the law. The old unionism is as deeply impressed as any Conservative can be, of the folly and wickedness of encouraging strikes under impossible conditions, as at Southampton, and of alarming public opinion and sacrificing the sympathies of great political forces as in the action of Mr. Burns at the Congress. If any were needed to prove this, it is to be found in the proceedings of the North Counties Weavers' Association the week before last. It is well known that the Lancashire cotton operatives are altogether opposed to the eight hours movement. Mr. David Holmes, the President of the Weavers' Association, a fortnight ago, backing up Mr. Birtwistle's retirement from the Parliamentary Committee of the Congress, made use of the following remarkable words:—"The weavers," he said, "had headed the subscription list every year, and they did not think themselves justified in furnishing the Parliamentary Committee with funds to be utilised by the London Socialists, who went up and down the country making a noise at other people's expense. They did not intend to be responsible for their actions in any degree, nor to contribute to their expenses. It was a matter of general opinion that the London Socialists were trying their utmost to turn the trade organisations of the country into one vast Socialistic movement; that their object was not unionism, but red-handed revolution. That seemed to be their policy, and Socialism was the rampant and predominating idea amongst them all."

What Lancashire thinks to-day, England will say to-morrow; and this plain pronouncement of the great cotton industry must have a tremendous effect in moulding public opinion with regard to the ultimate development of the labour movement. At present there is a deep schism in the ranks of labour as it is organised in trades unions. But outside the unions lie what may be called the democracy of labour, in opposition to aristocracy inside the unions. These make a third party, and one of which something may yet be heard. At present they are looked down upon by the trades unionists as a pariah race, and are treated as at Southampton, with contumely and violence. But at last the civil authorities have awakened to the fact that this immense body of unemployed citizens have as much right to protection in the pursuit of wages as any-one else. The calling out of the military at Southampton has proved beyond all doubt that in the future any attempt to intimidate non-unionist labourers will be dealt with very severely. Irish methods of disorder are not going to be permitted in Great Britain, and from this point of view the ill-wind at Southampton has blown some good to the unfortunate men whose necessities force them to take employment wherever it is to be got. The strike season, we fancy, is at an end for this year. Autumn is advancing and the winter approaches, when economic conditions make strikes very unprofitable operations. Certainly the year has been very prolific in labour disputes, and some hard lessons have been read on both sides.

LAST week the Bishop of Chester was present at a special service which was held in St. Matthew's, Birkenhead, for the purpose of introducing the Rev. C. Brooke-Gwynne, as curate-in-charge in succession to Dr. Camm.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—There still remain two or three statements of Dr. Hobart, on which I should like to comment. In my next letter, I hope to bring my criticism of Dr. Hobart's learned work to a conclusion, by summing up the evidence, and reviewing the course of the argument.

Dr. Hobart, as I have already mentioned, thinks that the words, "Physician, heal thyself" (Luke iv. 23), are "a slight intimation of the professional character of the writer"; but is not this notion contradicted by his statement as to the poor woman, namely, that "she had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could be healed of any" (Luke viii. 43), though it is true that the still stronger words of St. Mark (v. 26) "that she was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse" find no place.

Dr. Hobart, page 12, observes: "The word πονηρὸς is applied to evil spirits by St. Luke alone (ch. vii. 21) (except once, Matt. xii. 45)." "He uses it again viii. 2; xi. 26; Acts xix. 12, 13, 15, 16. This word was frequently used in medical language in relation to disease, etc., and one of its uses is identical with that of St. Luke here, for πονηρὸς indicates the active principle of evil (see Trench, 'Synonyms of the New Testament'), and is applied in the medical writers to what spreads destruction or corruption, *e.g.*, the poison of serpents." On page 7, Dr. Hobart quotes two passages from the Third Gospel and the Acts in which πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα are mentioned. Now Archdeacon Farrar says: "It is the characteristic of the oriental, and especially of the Semitic mind, to see in every event, even the most trivial, a direct supernatural interference, wrought by the innumerable unseen ministers—both good and evil—of the Divine will. The definite form in which the belief clothed itself was by the admission of the Jews themselves, derived from Babylon." "The evil spirits . . . were equally numerous. To them were attributed many results, which we should undoubtedly assign to purely natural causes, especially the phenomena of epilepsy," etc., (*Life of Christ*, Excursus vii., p. 745). Accordingly, we find πνεύμα πονηρόν (as in Luke and Matthew) in 1 Kings xix. 9 (of Saul), in Judges ix. 23, and also in the book of Tobit; we find πνεύμα ἀκάθαρτον (as in Luke iv. 36 and Acts viii. 7) in Zechariah xiii. 2, and in the New Testament in Matthew, Mark, and Revelation. Dr. Hobart also says, p. 7, "ὀχλεῖν is peculiar to St. Luke," and speaks of it as a "word much employed in medical language." This is said in reference to Acts v. 16 (ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων); but in Tobit vi. 7 I find the words ἐάν τινα ὀχλῇ δαιμόνιον ἢ πνεῦμα πονηρόν. The word ὀχλεῖν being also found in 2 Macc. No writings could be more thoroughly Jewish than Tobit and 2 Maccabees. How can any proof be drawn from all this that the writer of the Third Gospel was a medical man?

Again, Dr. Hobart, page 14, says in reference to Luke viii. 27, "St. Luke, too, states more clearly than the two other evangelists that the man had taken up his abode in the tombs as his dwelling-place. A propensity to do this is also mentioned by ancient physicians in connection with madness." The only authority, however, given by Dr. Hobart for this statement is Aetius, a Christian physician of Mesopotamia, who lived in the 6th century, A.D., and the most ancient physician quoted appears to be Galen, who as I have more than once pointed out is a whole century too late for Dr. Hobart's purpose. And does not St. Matthew (viii. 28) mention "two possessed with devils *coming out of the tombs*," etc.; and does not St. Mark (v. 2) say: "There met him *out of the tombs* a man with an unclean spirit." Dr. Farrar observes: "Tombs were the express dwelling-place of demons in the Jewish belief; when a man spends a night in a graveyard, an evil spirit descends upon him."—*Gfrörer* (*Life of Christ*, p. 254 n). And so we find that Isaiah makes reference to the iniquity of those "who remain among the graves, and lodge in the monuments" (ch. lxv. 4). How is that so many of Dr. Hobart's proofs in support of the medical authorship lead us not to the doctors but to Jewish writings and to Jewish traditions?

Once more, Dr. Hobart, p. 12, says: "In this passage (Luke vii. 21) diseases are divided into two classes—νόσοι and μαστίγες—chronic and acute (νόσος=χρόνια κακοπάθεια, Theophyl.). Aretæus, who wrote about St. Luke's time, makes a similar division, his medical works treating of the signs, causes, and cure of (1) acute and (2) chronic disease." Dr. Hobart gives no quotations in support of this statement; and he does not say that Aretæus uses these particular words νόσος and μάστιξ. As for Theophylact it is difficult to see how a writer, who *lived a thousand years later*, could throw any special light on the fine-drawn distinctions of language, or the precise shade of meaning in any passage of the Third Gospel. The ordinary meaning of νόσος appears from Liddell and Scott to be *sickness, disease;* while μάστιξ signifies, 1, *a whip, scourge.* 2, (metaphorically) *a plague.* Both words occur in the LXX.; νόσος being found in Deut. xxviii. 59 and 2 Chronicles; while μάστιξ occurs in Ps. xc. 10, Jeremiah, and 2 Maccabees; the plural μαστίγες is found in Psalms xxxi. 10, and lxxxviii. 32. Moreover, St. Mark uses both νόσος and μάστιξ (indifferently as meaning *disease*) within a few verses of each other (Mark iii. 10, 15). And with each of these two words he uses θεραπεύειν, which forms part of the phrase in Luke under discussion. It is well known what a close connection there is between the writings of these two Evangelists, St. Mark and St. Luke, both of whom wrote for Gentile readers. νόσος is also found in St. Matthew.

Again, page 95, Dr. Hobart observes, "πινακίδιον, peculiar to St. Luke, is of rare occurrence in Greek writers, the more usual terms being πίναξ and πινάκιον. Hippocrates uses it of his own tablets . . . . From its being thus connected with the distinguished name of Hippocrates, it would appear to have become a familiar word with physicians. Galen . . . . refers to this πινακίδιον." Dr. Hobart thinks (but where is the proof?) that "the word πινακίδιον continued to be a familiar one in medical language for a physician's note-book or tablet." Perhaps so, but was it not the natural, nay, the inevitable word? Is not πινακίδιον the simple diminutive of πίναξ; and was not πίναξ a very old and well-known word used by *Homer*, *Æschylus*, *Herodotus*, *Demosthenes*, *Aristophanes* and *Plutarch*? Is it not also found in each of the three first Evangelists? This diminutive πινακίδιον is used by Aristotle and Plutarch. πίναξ is used in Luke xi. 39 for *platter*, as in Matt. xiv. 8, and Mark vi. 25, where

the A.V. renders it *charger*. πίναξ sometimes signified "a board for public notices, a register"; if one wanted to speak of a "*pocket* πίναξ," would not one naturally use the *diminutive* πινακίδιον=writing tablet? The word occurs in the modern Greek Testament (Luke i. 63), and "while modern Greek is indebted largely to Plato for its form, to Aristotle it owes much of its vocabulary" (Geldart, *The Modern Greek Language*, p. 99). A word used by Aristotle would necessarily belong to the universally current Greek language; it could not slip out of memory or use, nor could it be confined to any particular caste or class—it would obviously be *pro bono publico*, or at least would naturally become the property of every educated man.

Dr. Hobart, p. 242, says: "χρώς, peculiar to St. Luke. The use of χρώς, to mean the body, not the skin, continued in medical language from Hippocrates to Galen, who states that it was derived from the Ionians. . . . St. Luke therefore in using χρώς here is speaking quite professionally." But is not χρώς used just in this so-called medical way "to mean the body, not the skin," in the Septuagint by the writer of Leviticus (xiii. 2) who speaks of "the skin of his *flesh*,"—ἐν δέρματι χρωτός—χρώς here being used for *flesh*, and obviously distinguished from "skin"—δέρμα.

Again at page 51, Dr. Hobart, on Acts xxviii. 3-6, says: "θηρίον. St. Luke uses this word here exactly in the same way as the medical writers who employed it to denote venomous serpents, and of these they applied it in particular to the viper (ἔχιδνα), so much so that an antidote, made chiefly from the flesh of vipers, was termed θηριακή. In the four following examples (from Aretæus) the same medicine is signified . . . . Dioscorides uses θηριόδηκτος to signify 'bitten by a serpent.'" With regard to the antidote of viper's flesh, Archbishop Trench observes: "Treacle or 'triacle' as Chaucer wrote it, was originally a Greek word (θηριακή), and wrapped up in itself the once popular belief (an anticipation, by the way, of homœopathy) that a confection of the viper's flesh was the most potent antidote against the viper's bite. Waller serves himself of this old legend, familiar enough in his time, for Milton speaks of the 'sovran treacle of sound doctrine,' while 'Venice treacle' or 'viper wine' was a common name for a supposed antidote against all poisons" (*English Past and Present*, p. 262). It appears from Liddell and Scott that θηριον is the diminutive form of θήρ=(a wild beast, a beast of prey), and "in usage equivalent to it =a *beast*; it is in fact the prose form of θήρ, as in Herodotus." Plato uses it of *animals* as opposed to plants; Theocritus uses it of a *dog*; and Polybius of an elephant. It is in fact the *generic* name of the animal creation; and is so used in the passage Dr. Hobart quotes from Dioscorides: θηριοδήκτοις βοηθεῖν μάλιστα δὲ ἐχιοδήκτοις—ἔχις here being one species of the genus θηρίον. Well, we have already found many of Dr. Hobart's so-called medical expressions in the first book of the LXX.; and now we have only to turn to the *first* verse of the *third* chapter of Genesis to find the statement that "the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field," which in the Septuagint reads: ὁ δὲ ὄφις ἦν φρονιμώτατος πάντων τῶν θηρίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, "Now the serpent was the most crafty of all the brutes on the earth." Moreover, with reference to Wisdom xvi. 5, I find in *Schleusner*, "θηρία, *serpentes*"—the passage dealing with the plague of venomous fiery serpents which "bit the people; and much people of Israel died" (Numbers xxi. 6). Hence we see that any Greek-speaking Jew with the LXX. in his hand would naturally think of θηρίον in connection with a "venomous serpent." I may add that ἔχιδνα (Acts xxviii. 3) is used by Æschylus, Sophocles, Herodotus and Plato.

At page 27 Dr. Hobart (in reference to Luke x. 30-35) observes: "This parable (of the good Samaritan) is peculiar to St. Luke, and from the incidents described in it was one most likely to be recorded by him; he may himself have attended in his professional practice on travellers in a similar case, for we find from a passage in Galen that it was not unusual for persons when seized with illness on a journey to take refuge in inns. Galen, too, uses the word 'half-dead' (ἡμιθανής, peculiar to St. Luke) in describing their case." But the word used by Galen in Dr. Hobart's quotations is *not* ἡμιθανής as in the Third Gospel, but ἡμιθνής; and this latter word is not peculiar to Galen, for it is used by Aristophanes and Thucydides. There is a third form of the word, namely, ἡμίθνητος, which occurs in the Septuagint (Wisdom xviii. 18). The particular form ἡμιθανής, found in Luke x. 30, does not appear to be used by any of the medical writers, but it is found in Strabo (B.C. 30). We scarcely need Galen to tell us "that it was not unusual for persons seized with illness to take refuge in inns." It seems the natural thing to do. Sick strangers in a strange land were not likely to be welcomed with open arms by the heathen private residents. Even in modern times, and in a Christian country, the poet sighed to think he had found—

"His warmest welcome at an inn."

We are reminded of the good Archbishop Leighton, who, it is well-known, had a desire to breathe his last at an inn, and this desire, we are told, was fulfilled. What has Dr. Hobart proved by all this; is he not here again, "not to put too fine a point upon it," "pushing his argument too far"? And if Dr. Hobart is so constantly found to be pushing his argument too far, and if his so-called proofs will not stand the test of all-searching, all-questioning criticism, what can they be worth, and what, after all, do they prove? They prove that Dr. Hobart is an earnest painstaking scholar, but they *do not prove that the author of the Third Gospel was a physician*. Again, p. 84, Dr. Hobart (on Luke xxii. 45) says: "St. Luke assigns an adequate cause for the excessive sleepiness of the disciples on this occasion. The other Evangelists merely say '*for their eyes were heavy*.' . . . . but St. Luke states that it arose from anxiety (ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης). It is evident that their condition was owing to their anxiety for their Lord, coupled with the want of their usual rest. It is remarkable how frequently this word λύπη is joined with *privation of sleep* (ἀγρυπνία) and *cares* (φροντίδες) in the medical writers, and assigned as a cause of an abnormal condition of the system, or even of disease." This use of the preposition ἀπὸ to indicate *origin* or *cause* is frequent enough. Thus St. Matthew has ἀπὸ τοῦ φοβοῦ (ch. xiv. 26); a similar use of ἀπὸ found in St. John xxi. 6, and occurs in the LXX. in Ps. cvi. 34, and Isaiah xxxii. 12, and 2 Chronicles. It is used in the same way by Thucydides and Herodotus. As for the word λύπη (what in a "vale of tears" can be more common than grief?) it is not peculiar to the Third Gospel. Indeed, it is only found there in this one passage, while St. Paul uses it *seven* times, and St. John *four* times. It is also found in Hebrews and 1 Peter. Moreover, it occurs at least *twelve* times in the LXX., and more

than once in the *earliest chapter of Genesis;* thus it occurs in the account of the Fall (Gen. iii. 17, 18), and in reference to the birth of Noah (Gen. v. 29), also in the pathetic words of Jacob about his youngest son Benjamin, related in the history of Joseph (Gen. xlii. 38, xliv. 29); also in Jonah, Proverbs, and Isaiah. The correlative ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς of this phrase (ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης) is found in Luke xxiv. 41, and Acts xii. 14; and this self-same phrase ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς is used by St. Matthew (ch. xiii. 44). Where is the medical connection here, and what, again, in this case, has Dr. Hobart proved? Not much, I imagine.

Dr. Hobart is so indefatigable that he only lays down his pen when he has reached the very last word in the Acts of the Apostles,—ἀκωλύτως. As to this, he says, p. 291, "ἀκωλύτως, peculiar to St. Luke, was in medical language employed to denote freedom, unhindered action, in a variety of things, such as respiration, perspiration, the pulse, the muscles, the members of the body." Then follow *ten* quotations from Galen. Dr. Hobart, in his preface, p. viii., observes: "In order to bring the work within reasonable bounds, it was found necessary that the number of examples of the medical use of a word should not, in any case, exceed ten. . . . . The examples, have, generally speaking, been taken, as far as possible, from all the medical authors to show the continuous and varied use of the words in medical language." "All the medical authors," only amount to *four* "all told," and a great gulf of nearly, if not quite, 500 years separates the first of these from the other three, and in this case, the whole ten examples come *en bloc* from Galen the latest of the four medical authors. This certainly cannot prove "the continuous and varied use" of this particular word ἀκωλύτως in "medical language." That it was medically used by Galen in the *second* century, does not throw much light on its use in the *first* century. It does not appear to have been used by Aretæus, the one medical writer who was perhaps a contemporary of the author of the Third Gospel. There is clearly nothing distinctively medical about the word. Moreover, we find the adjective ἀκώλυτος in the Septuagint in Wisdom vii. 23, while the adverb ἀκωλύτως as in Acts xxviii. 31, is at least as old as Plato, and is also used by Symmachus, contemporary with Galen, in Job vii. 31. What, I ask again, has Dr. Hobart proved by his ten quotations from Galen? Nothing at all.

I should only unduly tax the patience of your readers (already, I fear, somewhat severely tried) were I to take further examples. I am ready to discuss any of the so-called proofs adduced by Dr. Hobart in support of his theory. Plausible and impressive, as they at first sight appear, I venture to say that they will not stand the test of searching criticism, they will not bear the burden of the theory of medical authorship, they are, in fact, no *proofs* at all. It would, indeed, seem to be easier to prove that the writer of Acts xxvii. was a professional mariner than to prove that he was a professional medical man.

Referring to Acts xxvii. 27, "the shipmen deemed that they drew near to some country" (προσάγειν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν=that some land *was drawing near to them.*) Bishop Wordsworth observes: "St. Luke speaks here and elsewhere in the language of sailors"; and Kuinoel (quoted by Alford) remarks, "*Lucas optice loquitur nautarum more.*" Archdeacon Farrar tells us that the writer uses "in this chapter *seven* compounds of πλέω, and at least *ten other correct nautical terms.*" (The italics are not in Dr. Farrar.) Within the compass of this one chapter we have at least *thirty* nautical terms—some more than once repeated—*ship, boat, voyage, haven, mainsail, ropes, tackling, rudder, anchor, foreship, hinder part of the ship, sailors, master of the ship, owner of the ship, coast, creek, shore, island, wind, south wind, tempestuous wind, waves, quicksand, to sail, to launch, to sail under, to sail over, to strike sail, to lighten the ship, to fall upon the rocks, to cast out anchors, to let down the boat, to cast oneself into the sea, to escape safe to land.* Surely here are nautical terms in profusion—there is no need to add to them those words from the next chapter, which probably have before now been considered to be an early reference to the mariner's compass (Acts xxviii. 13). Archdeacon Norris has pointed out as a striking fact that the writer "occupies himself wholly, throughout a long chapter, with details of geography and navigation, of havens and islands, of rocks and shallows, of winds and currents, of sails and rudders, of nautical terms, of sailors' hopes and fears." Must we, then, jump to the conclusion that the writer was an able-bodied seaman? No, not at all. He was no more an "ancient mariner" than he was an ancient medical practitioner. He was an educated observant, travelled, many-sided man, intensely interested in his own experiences, which he wrote with deep feeling and vivid imagination in forcible language and *sympathetic* ink. He chooses on almost all occasions the most proper epithet and the most striking expression, and, in this case, as Archdeacon Norris says, the nautical language is explained by the fact that this chapter is "*the* crisis of St. Luke's whole narrative."

Dr. Hobart sees his own side of the case clearly enough, but he does not look an inch beyond. He forgets the wise precept *audi alteram partem.* Like Aristotle he falls into (that fruitful source of error) the pitfall of *a partial induction.* I can not refrain from quoting a few sentences of Bacon's criticism of Aristotle, which, *mutatis mutandis*, might (in a *mitigated* form) be applied to Dr. Hobart. "Aristotle is an example of the kind of philosophy in which much is made out of little; so that *the basis of experience is too narrow . . . . Being everywhere more careful how one may give a ready answer, and make a positive assertion* than how he may apprehend the variety of nature. . . . . *Nor let anyone be moved by this that in his books . . . . there is often a quoting of experiments. For he had made up his mind beforehand*, and did not consult experience in order to make right propositions . . . . but when *he had settled his system to his will*, he twisted experience round, and made her bend to his system." (The italics are not in Bacon.) So I venture to say Dr. Hobart "makes his basis of experience too narrow"; he quotes a goodly array of facts, but "he had made up his mind beforehand" and "had settled his system to his will." He has most carefully explored the surface; but he has not dug deep enough to reach the foundations. He has not mastered the whole case, nor collected and considered all the evidence. He confines his researches to the *four* medical writers, and ignores (to all intents and purposes) the *score* of Jewish writers in the Septuagint, as well as the immense and unmistakable influence of Judaism on the author of the Third Gospel.

H. HEBER EVANS.

August 19th, 1890.

THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH.

SIR,—While reading the conflicting opinions in recent numbers of the PULPIT, as to the degree of authority the words of the Saviour possess on topics not immediately connected with spiritual interests, I am reminded of some thoughts which presented themselves to me a few years since. I was not then able, nor am I now able, to perceive adequate grounds for the belief that the Word was not only "made flesh," but was also united to a created human spirit. Bishop Pearson and Archdeacon Wilberforce have given reasons for that opinion, but they are not convincing to my own mind. The argument that appears strongest to me is, that the Saviour, just before the moment of death, commended His spirit to the Father. This is recorded by Luke, but not by the other Evangelists. I have not sufficient knowledge to decide whether the word translated *spirit* might not more properly be rendered *soul*, or *life—anima*, and not *spiritus*. Such a meaning would, I think, be more appropriate to an occasion of such deep solemnity, than to suppose that a created spirit was commended to the Father. To my own mind the real meaning of those last words before death seems to be that the Saviour resigned His life, in full assurance that it would be revived.

As far as I am aware, the doctrine referred to has been tacitly held, but seldom distinctly enunciated. I think it tends to produce confusion of thought, and even an approach to idolatry, to suppose that a created living immortal essence, or spirit, became so inseparably mixed with the Divine Nature as to share in the adoration offered to the Word or Son. A created spirit is a distinct entity or individuality, having self-consciousness, but to which omnipresence omnipotence and omniscience cannot be ascribed. I do not believe the declarations of Scripture warrant the notion that the Saviour had a created self-conscious individuality within His wondrous Person and united to the Divine Nature. The idea I derive is, that the Word was made flesh; the Divine Nature became incarnate—that Jesus Christ, being in the form of God, "emptied Himself." (See Revised Version.) We can only vaguely conceive the meaning of that phrase. The Divine nature was so united to the flesh that the Divine Word condescended to be bound and limited by cerebral and nervous organs, and was affected by the weakness and infirmities of the body. The assaults of the Devil were, I conjecture, made against the seat of the intellectual and moral faculties in the body, sometimes called the *soul*. There is one peculiarity which distinguished Him from all men. "God giveth not the spirit by measure unto Him." (John iii. 34.) In His own language the consciousness that he possessed the Divine Nature was frequently manifested, and there were also intimations of limits and self-imposed restraints in regard to knowledge. (Mark xiii. 32.) All this we cannot understand, and need not wonder, as the connection between our own spirits and bodies is an impenetrable mystery.

The conclusion impressed on me is, that the Saviour's teachings were intended to serve transcendently important moral and spiritual purposes, but not to add to our knowledge on other points. At the same time, the language he employed concerning Jonah appears, to my mind, to confirm the truth of the Biblical narrative. That narrative is most marvellous, but, at the same time, awakens a sense of grandeur and almost of sublimity. We are surrounded by marvels which we cannot explain, although habit has made them appear commonplace. The present century has furnished experiences to our senses and our mental faculties, a prognostication of which a hundred years ago would have been regarded as an excursion into fairyland.

If the doctrine which I am opposing had not been held, the idea that the great sacrifice for sin was not a reality, but was effected by proxy would not have arisen. Bishop Pearson said:—"While we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our assertion as to deny that the Divine Nature of our Saviour suffered." He must mean that the created human spirit suffered so that the sufferings were borne by a created being. I merely bring this forward without commenting on it, and may add that Athanasius (translated by Dr. Pusey) expresses himself in a way substantially the same as Dr. Pearson.

J. B.

Canonbury, 19th September, 1890.

A CORRECTION.

SIR,—The PULPIT of 30th August contains the following, under the head of Reviews and Notices:—

"'Cassiope and other Poems,' by Boleyne Reeves. We find in this little volume several pieces which have appeared from time to time in the PULPIT with the familiar subscription 'J. J. M.'; so we take leave to regard the author's name as a *nom de plume*."

As those are my initials, and as I have occasionally contributed poetry to the PULPIT for some years past, it may be thought that I have now republished these under the name of Boleyne Reeves. I wish to assure your readers that I have done no such thing. My poems in the PULPIT have been usually signed with my full name, and never with my initials. Your reviewer has evidently confounded "Cassiope and other Poems, by Boleyne Reeves" with "Sonnets and other Poems, chiefly religious, by Joseph John Murphy," which has no doubt been sent you for review.

I should have written to the above effect immediately, but I waited to see whether you would set me right with your readers by printing a brief notice of my poems.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 15th September, 1890.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arnold, Rev. W., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Taunton ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Taunton.
Becker, Rev. Charles Maxwell, M.A., Curate of Stower Provost, Dorset ; Chaplain of the Burmah Assistant Clergy Society.
Browne, Alfred York, M.A., Chaplain on the Bombay Establishment.
Cudmore, Rev. John Francis Edward, M.A., Vicar of Lutton, Lincolnshire.
Dibben, Rev. J. A., M.A., Vicar of Timperley ; Vicar of Astley, near Nuneaton.
Duncan, Rev. Robert, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Whitehaven; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Carlisle.
Fell, Rev. James, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Fox, Rev. W. Russell, Curate of Bideford ; Vicar of Down St. Mary, Devonshire.
Glazebrook, Rev. Michael George, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Haines, Rev. Frank W., B.A., Ex-Chaplain of Sunningdale School, Berks ; Chaplain at Selangor Straits Settlements.
Hughes, Rev. William Henry, Vicar of St. Hilary, Cornwall.
Jones, Rev. Evan Mayhew, B.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Oldham ; Vicar of St. Thomas's, Moorside, near Oldham.
Jones, Rev. Martin Luther, Curate of Aberdare ; Perpetual Curate of Aberaman, Glamorganshire.
Jones, Rev. William Davies, Curate of St. Woolos, Newport ; Vicar of Llanellen, Monmouthshire.
Marsh, Rev. Richard, M.A., Chaplain of the Northwich Union Workhouse ; Vicar of Thorley, Durham.
Mayne, Canon, M.A., Vicar of St. Catherine's, Gloucester ; Rector of Christian Malford, Wiltshire.
Miller, R. B., M.A., Incumbent of All Saints', Sidmouth ; Vicar of Christ Church, Winchester.
Midford, Rev. William Ledwich, M.A., Vicar of Mullyon ; Rector of Ickburgh-with-Langford, Norfolk.
Nevill, Rev. Edmund R., Assistant-Curate of St. Pancras ; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans.
Puckle, Rev. Thomas John, M.A., Vicar of Long Wittenham, Berks.
Reed, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Excellent*.
Rubie, Rev. Alfred Edward, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Richmond, Yorkshire.
Shaw, Rev. William Stokes, M.A., Vicar of Tiverton-on-Avon, Bath ; Rector of Stapleton, Bristol.
Smythe, Rev. Patrick Murray, B.A.. Vicar of Westbury-with-Dilton, Wilts ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Salisbury.
Tisdall, Rev. A. O., M.A., Curate of St. John the Baptist's, the Brook, Liverpool ; Vicar of St. John's, Highbridge.
Trower, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Otley and Perpetual Curate of Farnley, Yorkshire (by dispensation).
Wilkes, Rev. Thomas William, M.A., Curate of St. Stephen's, Willenhall ; Vicar of West Smethwick.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Davies, Rev. John, M.A., M.R.A.S.. formerly Rector of Walsoken, Norfolk, at 16, Belsize-square, on the 18th inst.

Davies, Venerable R. W. P., M.A., late Archdeacon of Brecon, J.P. for the counties of Brecon and Monmouth, at Court-y-Gollen, Crickhowell, on the 14th inst., aged 83.

Dodd, Rev. Edward Sutton, Vicar of Milton Ernest, at Milton Ernest Vicarage, on the 20th inst., aged 46.

Freke, Rev. John Henry, for many years Rector of Stackallan parish, at Stackallan, Meath, on the 12th inst., aged 79.

Harvey, Rev. T. H., C.M.S. College, Ningpo, China, late of Handel College, Southampton, from cholera, on the way to Japan, on the 19th ult., aged 29 years.

Speirs, Rev. James, Chaplain to the Forces (retired), at Lumville, Curragh Camp, on the 16th inst., aged 74.

Topham, Rev. Robert, at Shelton, on the 16th inst., aged 72.

Twisleton, Hon. and Rev. Charles, late Rector of Ashow, at Woodlands, Kenilworth, on the 13th inst., aged 84.

Watkins, Rev. Daniel, Rector of Adstock, on the 13th inst., aged 87.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

HULL CHURCH CONGRESS.

The President's Address.

Delivered by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Durham, on Tuesday, September 30th, 1890.

A FEELING which is universal needs no detailed expression. Every one here feels, though none can feel so keenly as myself, how much the Congress loses by the absence of its president. We shall miss at every point his large experience, his firm authority, his just judgment. Many of the subjects which will be brought before us in debate he has already made his own; and one must now trust that he will be able, at some future opportunity, to review the discussion which we expected him to inspire and to guide by his counsel and tact. Of my own experience I will say nothing. The circumstances under which I have undertaken a duty which, in the absence of the president, was supposed to devolve upon my see, will assure me of that generous forbearance and ready help which will, I trust, enable me to discharge it without serious disadvantage to the business of the Congress. We shall have to deal, as the Archbishop has reminded us, with many "burning questions," but we shall deal with them as men who stand in the presence of a living Lord, and who believe that they can hear His voice in the silence of the soul. To recall that presence is to still at once the tumult of debate; to listen to that voice is to silence the language of self-assertion. I might, perhaps, have reasonably claimed exemption from the task of delivering an address; but, even though I must speak under every disadvantage of hasty attendance, I desire to mark emphatically one aspect of the programme. It gives a most conspicuous place to social questions. We are asked to consider theories and problems; we are asked to consider evils and remedies bearing upon them; the idea of social organisation, and the ethics of industrial intercourse; the spiritual responsibility of employers, and the present relationship of capital and labour; the crowding of masses of men in small spaces; the passion for betting and gambling; and the institution of Brotherhoods. I rejoice in the selection of topics which the committee has made. They have, I believe, discerned rightly, that the "social question" in its complete range is a question of religion that it offers us the means of realising our faith in its present power. They have discerned the message which God is addressing to our own age, the way through which He is offering a fresh vindication of the eternal Gospel, the work which He has prepared for our English Church. The social question, the questions of the relation of man to man, of man to the city and the nation, of man to the means of production and employment, is, I say, a religious question. Perhaps I should be more nearly right if I was to say it is *the* religious question. It is a question not simply of politics, of economics or law, but of life. And the Christian faith, which is the expression of the Incarnation, deals with all life as it deals with the whole man, with body and soul no less than with spirit. A man's work scarcely less than his creed contributes to mould his character. For the most part a man's work is not the preparation for his life; it is his life itself. In any case the conditions and the results of labour, the opportunities and the encouragements for thought, the circumstances of family intercourse, go far to make him what he is. If, then, there are, as is alleged, through the industrial revolution through which we have passed, many whose whole energies are exhausted in providing for others the means of rest and culture, which they cannot share; if there are many whose long hours of labour forbid them to see their children except when they are asleep; if there are many whose earnings do not provide adequate support for those who are naturally dependent upon them; if, in some occupations, current wages have to be supplemented by doles, the Christian, as a Christian, must bend his energies to face the evil and to endeavour to remedy it. (Cheers.) Self-interest is powerless to cope with moral questions; the law alone is powerless; but love, fruitful in sacrifice, can do all things. It is, indeed, natural to have recourse to legislation when we recognise a wrong, and up to a certain point the procedure is just, and may be effective. But the law is concerned only with outward acts and environments, and cannot control feelings or motives. It can secure personal opportunities and remove common injuries due to past ignorance or neglect. It can make good dwellings, but it cannot make good men. The sanction in the end is the will of the majority, which may quickly become tyranny. If the law is far in advance of general opinion it is evaded. If it is opposed to the judgment of the best informed its influence is immoral. And more than this, we help men most not when we establish a right for them, but when we quicken in them a sense of duty. Law, in a word, has no direct spiritual power. But what law cannot do the personal ministry of love can do. It can appeal to the conscience for the sense of justice, and to the imagination for the apprehension of beauty, and to natural affection for the offering of sacrifice. It can call out reverence for the human which survives in the outcast. It can quicken, guard, develop independence, self-reliance, self-respect in

the poorest, being not isolated or warring atoms in an aggregate, but members in a body, each charged with some peculiar function. It can consecrate great possessions to a common service, and win a blessing from the cares of a great position. The social questions, then, must be religious questions. They touch the unseen in their essence. They cannot be solved by the assurance of a material wellbeing, but they can be solved by love, which transfigures where it finds an entrance. Of such love, active, pervading individuals, Christianity commands the source, and that aspect of the faith which gives directness and intensity to the social aspect of Christian love is just now laid open to us by the forces of modern thought—the fellowship of men in the past, the present, and the future. When St. Paul said to the Galatians, "There can be neither Jew nor Greek; there can be neither bond or free; there can be no male and female, for ye are all—not one only—but one man in Christ Jesus"; he revealed the Master's truth of the Divine continuity, of the Divine solidarity of human life in Christ, which we are at length beginning to realise. We are one man in Christ. That which once seemed to be a bold metaphor is now more and more apprehended as an overwhelming and yet invigorating fact. It is beginning to tell upon the mutual relation of classes and of factions; leaders of men are coming to realise that the loss of one cannot, on the whole, be the gain of another in the unity of the one life. The competition of trade has been assimilated to the competition of war, and condemned by the assimilation. Nowhere is the change which is passing over contemporary thought more impressive than in the writings of the latest school of economists. They have learned, and they are teaching with persuasive power, that their science is not hard, narrow, abstract, individualistic, but historical and moral, dealing with the changing phenomena of human progress, that it is not simply "a study of wealth, but part of the study of man." They point out that in the growth of society the State necessarily tends to fulfil functions which in earlier times were fulfilled by private men, and that true individuality is developed at the cost of independence through the family, the class, the nation, the race, till we reach perfection of humanity, when the thought of self is lost in the energy of service, so true it is that in the end all patient investigation of the facts of our nature leads up to the message of the Gospel. Looking to the teaching of these new lessons we learn patience. We accept that which seems to us to be slowness in the fulfilment of the Divine counsel. We put aside theories, however attractive, which break the growth of the new order from the old. A violent revolution can destroy, but it cannot construct. And, while we watch the gradual process of change, we feel as we penetrate a little deeper to the heart of our faith that we possess in the Gospel of the *Word become flesh* the solid foundation of the noblest thoughts that we can fashion for humanity, and the sole prevailing motive which can sustain endeavour in seasons of failure and disappointment. As Christians we start from the thought of one man in Christ Jesus that we may be filled with the enthusiasm of action, and we return to it when fulfilment lingers that we may keep hope fresh. As Christians, we seek from first to last to strengthen by our own faith those who have it not, and yet labour with us for the one cause of human fellowship. As Christians, we live and move in a conscious communion with the Unseen, and draw from an inexhaustible spring the help which sustains our powers. In this respect the Old Testament has an office which, I think, has not yet been adequately studied. In saying this I do not here enter on any critical problems; those do not affect my position. In any case the Old Testament as it was received in the Apostolic age is ratified as the elementary charter of typical social obligations and the authoritative record of the Divine method of national discipline. If we study the constituent books in this light; if we watch the complementary work of priests and prophets which they pourtray; if we realise the conception which they give of the true relations of man to man and God; if we trace back the outpourings of personal religion in the Psalter to the influences of public teaching and worship, we shall gain, believe me, such a sense of the inspiration of the books, which indeed form one book, that literary questions as to their origin will appear to be of little spiritual importance. (Cheers.) In some respects the teaching of the Old Testament seems to me to be at the present time of more importance than the teaching of the New Testament. It presents to us on a small scale, and under the conditions of a rude society, the right relations of a nation of brethren. Israel, which was by descent one family, offers the image of what the nations have become in Christ. The obligations and fellowships of Israelites are a figure of our own. I will venture to add that the English Church, more than any other Church, is in a position to enforce the lesson on the people whom it represents. And as we feel the need, it is our obligation to supply it. The Church has grown with the nation. The teachers, in their training and in their work, remain in contact with every class. They know their countrymen in the whole range of their interests, and are known by them. But that the English Church may fulfil its function, the clergy must gather round them, as they can do, bodies of fellow-workers, who will bring the influence of the faith to bear directly upon every Englishman. Their work of evangelisation cannot be done from the pulpit, or the platform, or the class-room. They must provide that their message shall be brought by teachers to individual hearers in natural intercourse. (Cheers.) We need, therefore, brotherhoods of

laymen who will fulfil their service through their ordinary duties of social life, and social independence, and social interest. We need—we need, I think, above all things—companies of men and women, brethren and sisters of the common hope, who will show openly in the sight of all the simplicity of the noblest life, the joy of service, the supremacy of love, as the motive for action. And, as we feel the need, it is our obligation to supply it. The industrial conditions which occasion our present distress are due to the enterprise and energy of Englishmen in the last century. It is, then, the duty of Englishmen to overcome, by the exercise of corresponding qualities, the difficulties which they have caused. The line of industrial movement marks, let us be thankful, continuous progress hitherto. To follow it, as the production has passed from the workman to the large employer, from the large employer to the company, is to be filled with hope for the next step. It will be said that these are "only ideals." I reply that ideals alone are fruitful. If they are true—nature, life, conscience, combine to assure us that these ideals, social life, social dependence, and social interests are true—they are glimpses of the Divine reality of things. We do not create them; we simply discern them, and our duty is to use them as the moulding principles of our action. In Christianity the fact and the idea absolutely coincide; and as we come to know, through the teachings of experience, the external fact a little better, the soul finds in the corresponding ideal inspiration for fresh efforts. Each time has, as it appears, in due measure its own revelation. We are at present gaining a firmer grasp on the connection of man with man, and of man with nature, and the spirit of God is even now guiding us to a better understanding of the Gospel in which this connection is hallowed. We are standing, as I in my heart believe, in the presence of a speaking God, as men have not stood for long ages. If, then, we English Churchmen hear the Voice which offers to us the thought of human fellowship in Christ, there is a positive strength in obedience for the guidance of our work; if we feel the overpowering grandeur of the charge which is committed to us by our position, by our inheritance, by our opportunities. I cannot think that we shall imperil the fulfilment of our office through any self-assertion or proud maintenance of personal convictions on matters of secondary importance. There are some things in the constitution of our Church which we may all wish to see changed; but can we point to any Church in any age in which the blots have been fewer? The marvellous spread of self-denying zeal among us has been unfavourable to the growth of wise and patient self-restraint. But, perhaps, even now God is preparing us to prove afresh the reality of our living faith. No sacrifice which is made to legitimate authority can be finally a loss. There is a positive strength in obedience. The exercise of power is chastened by the sense of responsibility. Old precedents cannot completely cover new conditions, but the Church has not been left orphaned by its Lord; and this Congress will not have met in vain if with one heart and soul we silently resolve to welcome what may be spoken by him who has the right to speak on matters which have long been debated, not as defining afresh what has been left doubtful, or limiting the objects of future effort, but simply as determining our present position from a comprehensive survey of the whole evidence. Our distress will then become a blessing, as our trial is assuredly by a spiritual opportunity. We shall feel, as perhaps we have never felt before, that we are a Church, a living Church, and not an aggregate of congregations. I must ask the indulgence of the Congress if I have spoken too freely out of the fulness of my heart. But I do wish that I could convey to you in any way the conviction which has grown with my growth from my school days at Birmingham, which were spent at the time of the Chartist movement, that God is calling our English Church to proclaim the Gospel for which the world is waiting—the social message of the Incarnation—the conviction which, as I look around upon this vast assembly, rises to my mind—that our differences, divisions, and misunderstandings would shrivel to their true proportions if only God would give us grace to feel the magnitude and the urgency of the call.

THE LIMITS OF CHRIST'S KNOWLEDGE.

By the Most Rev. the Bishop of Meath.

Sermon Preached in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on Sunday, August 24th, 1890.

"For it became Him for Whom are all things, and through Whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

"Though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered."—Hebrews ii. 10, and v. 8.

"THAT which hath been is that which shall be, and that which hath been done is that which shall be done, and there is no new thing under the sun."

This is the dictum of a man who certainly wrote not less than two thousand years ago, and so far as the flux and reflux of thought and opinion goes, and the varieties of action which depend thereon, it is as true now as when the Preacher wrote it. For discoveries are confined to science, and its applications to those branches of knowledge which, though not strictly scientific, are yet akin to science. But moral or mental discoveries there are none. Metaphysics is a weary round of undemonstrable thought, which makes no advance; and in morality we are not beyond the eternal morality of the New Testament. We can

call brotherly love altruism if we please, but we do not thereby alter its nature.

I make these remarks by way of introduction to an outline of the history of certain aberrations of opinion in the early Church, which I conceive may be of use for the understanding and answering of some difficulties recently raised against Christianity, because these difficulties are due to similar aberrations of opinion extensively, but unconsciously, entertained in our own days.

The doctrine of the Person of our Saviour is logically anterior to the doctrine of His work. The Incarnation precedes the Atonement, and the Atonement without the Incarnation is unintelligible. It is no wonder that the doctrine which lies at the root of Christianity should be mysterious and liable to misconstruction. On the other hand, if misconstrued, it cannot but involve in misconstruction everything dependent on it. The true conception of the union between the divine and human in the Person of our blessed Lord involves of necessity the assertion of both these natures in their perfection. Yet one portion of our Lord's existence may seem incompatible with this double perfection. My texts hint a truth which has been too frequently forgotten. "The Captain of our salvation was made perfect through suffering." In that case He was not perfect before He suffered. "Though a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things He suffered." It would seem that Christ had to learn something during His abode on earth. Whether it was a theoretic truth or a practical morality flowing from that truth, or both, something He had to learn.

For a considerable time the Church hardly thought of these mysteries. The ascertainment of our Lord's proper Deity in the fourth century, at the great Synod of Nicæa, and the long struggle with Arianism that followed it, had left a kind of exhaustion in the Christian consciousness. Satisfied with the declaration that the Son was of one substance or essence with the Father, and having applied to Christ by anticipation the whole fulness of the words used by St. John concerning the creative function of the *Logos*, or Word of God, an anticipation justified by St. John's speaking of Christ as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, the Church for some time made no effort to define the mode of union of the two natures in our Lord. This union is implied in her solemn declaration that the Lord Jesus Christ in His divine capacity the only begotten Son, begotten before all worlds, of one substance with the Father, and by whom all things were made, was, nevertheless, in His human capacity made man at a definite period in the history of the world, being Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. The two natures, the eternal Godhead and the non-eternal Humanity, were placed side by side, their union asserted, but the nature and conditions of that union unexamined; and the anticipating language of the creed, predicating of Christ the action ascribed by St. John to the *Logos* or word that dwelt in Christ, might easily lend itself to mistakes fatal to the complex character and work of Christ.

Accordingly, after an interval of rest from exhausting thought, mistakes of this kind made their appearance with the revival of speculation. On the one hand arose a sect which, in their anxiety to vindicate the reality of Christ's human nature, seemed to deny the reality of the Incarnation, some of its crudest advocates maintaining that the Deity was not united to the humanity at the moment of conception, but only subsequently, either when the Saviour was born or when the Holy Ghost descended on Jesus at His baptism. On the other hand another sect sprang up which, in its zeal to assert the proper and indefeasible divinity of Christ, maintained that the divine nature in the Saviour so superseded the human nature, either by substitution or absorption, that in Christ there was really no human nature at all, except the nature of a human body, the human soul being supplanted by the Godhead, so that no proper human character was left. The former of these heresies imperilled the efficacy of the atonement and the permanence of Christ's mediatorship. The latter under the pretext, or even with the wish of honouring Christ, deprived His life and acts of all reality, annihilated both the temptation in the wilderness and the temptation on the Cross, destroyed Christ's sympathy with man, and consequently the reality of His mediatorial function. For, if Christ were only God, He could not be a Mediator between man and God. Nor, if He were only God, could His life be any example to us, since it would have no human element.

The struggle between these opposing heresies convulsed the Church during the fifth and following centuries. The first of them we may dismiss from our present consideration, as it soon lost its influence in the Church within the Roman Empire, though in modern times the tendency that led to it came to the front again in what its adherents call Unitarianism—a term to which they have no right, inasmuch as it implies that *they* alone believe in the Unity of God, who deny the Deity of Christ. But the second of these two heresies, which received the name of Monophysite, from two Greek words denoting singleness of nature, because it asserted that there was only one single nature in the person of our Lord—this heresy, I say, is still actively, though furtively, at work in Christendom, and is becoming dangerous in two ways: first, as impeaching the reality of Christ's work, and destroying the comfort we ought to have in Him as our sympathising Saviour; secondly, as begetting attacks on Christianity which, from its stand-point, it is impossible to meet.

I shall consider these two mischievous effects of

Monophysitism separately, though it will soon be perceived that they dove-tail into each other.

1. If Christ be merely God, taking indeed the shape of man, but not man's whole nature, then all human feeling in Christ is at once annihilated. He can have no fellow-feeling with our temptations, for, if merely God, He could not be really tempted. The whole scene in the wilderness becomes at once unreal—a mere piece of acting, by which we are to suppose the Devil was deceived as much as they to whom the transaction was reported. The stress and pressure of trial and sorrow could not have been felt by one who was simply God dressed out in human shape; and, therefore, all that most precious representation in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of which millions on millions have experienced the comfort, the exquisite conception of the great High Priest, who can indeed be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having been tempted on all points like as we are, only without sin, must be abandoned; it is absolutely and radically false. Of course, too, the idea of Christ having learned obedience, or anything else indeed through suffering, must likewise be abandoned, if He be mere God. For God can have nothing to learn. The words of St. Luke, that "Jesus grew in *wisdom* as well as in stature and in *favour* with *God* and men," are also in that case untrue. If the one sole nature of Deity occupied the child as well as the man, there could have been no growth in wisdom, whatever there might have been in stature, nor any growth in favour, with God at least. The displays of human feeling which are so frequently recorded of our blessed Lord were likewise in that case mere acting. When He looked round with indignation, being grieved at the hardship of His hearer's hearts, the indignation and the grief were alike simulated, for the Deity can have no passions. When He burst into tears at the sight of the doomed city whose overthrow He had vainly endeavoured to avert, it was acting. When He wept at the grave of Lazarus, it was acting. So does the heresy which pretends to honour Christ most offer Him the foulest indignity, representing Him as practising a long series of deceptions on the unwary simplicity of His disciples. Nay, even on the Cross, it does not cease blaspheming Him, who, on its principles, could be no real sufferer, could never have felt forsaken by His heavenly Father, could never be properly said to have overcome the bitterness of a death which to Him, as mere God, could have had no bitterness.

It can hardly be necessary to enforce on you the necessity of standing aloof from such a doctrine as this. When thus presented in its naked simplicity and unavoidable results, it can have no attractions for any sincere and devout Christian. And its deadening influence may be seen in the history of the nations that have adopted it. The Coptic and Abyssinian Churches, where it has reigned ever since the middle of the fifth century, are proverbial for their entire lack of spiritual life. Nay, they have even brought social barbarism on their unhappy members. Egypt and Abyssinia welcomed the Saracen invader in the seventh century, and chose to submit to the followers of Mohammed, when they might, by a patriotic resistance, have saved themselves to Christendom and the empire which was then the chief bulwark of Christendom; and ever since the Christians in those countries have been lost to all higher civilization, and sunk in abject slavery. They have done nothing for the Christ whom they fancy they alone duly honour; they have wrecked Christianity in their hatred of orthodoxy.

Such have been the fatal results of the system which denies to Christ all real participation in our nature. We probably feel as if there were not the slightest danger of ourselves incurring similar disasters. But there is, I fear, even amongst ourselves, a good deal of unconscious Monophysitism. The denial of Christ's true human nature may not be formulated in so many words—may, indeed, be rejected as something strange and horrible when put into so many words, and yet may be there all the while lurking in the secret recesses of our hearts. Would any one in this congregation have dared to conceive of Christ as "learning obedience" through His sufferings had he not been told so in Scripture? Does not the phrase sound exceedingly startling? Should we have ever dreamed of Christ "being perfected through sufferings" supposing we had not the direct warrant of Scripture for the thought? When St. Paul tells us that we are to set Christ before us as our pattern in His humiliation, and when he then describes that humiliation in terms which the translators of our Authorised Version apparently could not quite understand, or from the full meaning of which they shrank—for they only tell us that Christ Jesus made Himself of no reputation, whereas what Paul tells in his forcible Greek is that Christ *emptied* Himself, that He resigned every divine prerogative that would have been inconsistent with His fully sharing all the limitations of human existence in itself, all the sinless infirmities and imperfections of our present state—when Paul tells us this, and when our Lord Himself corroborates Paul by assuring us that of the times and seasons He knows nothing; that He had emptied Himself of the knowledge of them, which, as mere God, He must have possessed; when He shows that on points of natural philosophy He was not beyond the level of His age, inasmuch as He speaks as though salt could lose its savour, which we know it cannot do, are we not too generally inclined to shrink from these results, though they are simply the necessary consequences of an Incarnation such as that in which we believe, an Incarnation which does not sink the human in the divine?

Christ could, indeed, read men's hearts, and knew by instinct what was passing in them. He had in fullest measure that intuitive power which all great men have possessed in some degree. He could say of one, "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile," and justify His judgment by an appeal to what had passed in His sight under the fig-tree. Nay, he even read the life of the woman of Samaria in the thoughts that coursed through her mind when He told her to fetch her husband. But every one must feel what a difference there is between this knowledge of the hearts of those with whom He had to deal, and with whom He was brought into personal contact, and a knowledge of the events of the past history of the world beyond what the documents available in His time could give. Had any moral or religious purpose been subserved by the correcting of those documents, we may presume it would have been made known to Him, just as the abrogation of the ancient law of revenge, of the ancient law of divorce, of the traditional permission to hate one's enemies, was part of His commission. But what moral or religious end was to be gained by informing the Jews of His day that the deluge was partial, not universal, when the only purpose for which He incidentally alluded to it was to emphasize, by its suddenness, the warning He was impressing on His hearers of the suddenness of His own return to judge them? Was He to have wasted His time, and to have shocked their prepossessions by anticipating the results (if, indeed, they are the results) of modern geological research?

2. And this naturally leads to the second part of the subject I have undertaken to bring before you. Attacks are now being continually made on the authority of our Lord, based on exactly such misconceptions of His nature and of His mission as I have noticed. Christ could not have been God, because, if God, He must have been omniscient, and therefore could have not been liable to mistakes or misconceptions on any subject. He speaks of the deluge as a fact in the history of man, whereas science, we are now informed, assures us that no universal deluge ever took place, the whole story of the deluge being merely an exaggerated tradition of some partial inundation in the valley of the Euphrates. But our Lord never asserts that the deluge was universal, and a partial deluge will afford exactly the same useful warning as a universal one. Again, Christ assigns certain Psalms to David, which some modern critics ascribe to an era long subsequent to David. I may claim some right to speak on this point with the authority of one who has studied the original text, and I must say that I entirely agree with the greatest Hebrew scholar of this century, Ewald, when he declares of the 110th Psalm, which is the only one in which anything material turns upon the authorship, that it cannot have been written by any one but David. The character of its language is decisive of its antiquity. To ascribe it to the times after the Babylonian captivity, as some modern critics do, is as great an anachronism as to ascribe Chaucer's poetry to the age of Milton. And these are representative instances of the charge of ignorance brought against our Lord, and which is to dispose at once of His divinity and of His mission. A third instance is His ignorance of the date of the Mosaic legislation. Ingenious theories have of late been broached to the intent that the Pentateuch is not merely a composite work, which no critic now denies, but that its greater part is of late authorship. One of its books, the book of Deuteronomy, was written centuries after Moses, and yet speaks in the name of Moses, and this at once stamps it as a forgery, and deprives it of all authority. Now, as our Lord evidently refers to it as if it were authoritative, He cannot have known what modern criticism has discovered, and, therefore, cannot be God, nor even a messenger sent by God. But whether Deuteronomy in its present shape was written 1,600 or only 600 years before Christ came matters very little, if the predictions it contains have been fulfilled. And no one who reads them, or the predictions in Leviticus, which denounce God's wrath on disobedience, can deny that they have been fulfilled in the history of the chosen people. It matters little by whom the book was written, so that the book be true. Whether the Pentateuch in its present shape was compiled by Moses or by some editor centuries after, there can be no doubt that it does contain substantially the legislation by which Moses created a nation, and sundered it for ever from all others. No subsequent origin would have produced that unique effect. The unfaltering tradition of an Oriental race, corroborated by the tenacity with which it has for 2,500 years clung to the law which is at the root of that tradition, still more, the extraordinary fact that every denunciation and menace contained in the book of the law has been literally fulfilled; the present existence of the nation, dispersed over all the world, and yet remaining as distinct as ever from the nations amidst which it moves without mingling with them—these things are proofs of the substantial truth and of the authority of the Hebrew sacred books, which no criticism can invalidate.

But, apart from the question of the general historic accuracy of the Pentateuch, our Lord's divinity and mission cannot be impeached by any defects of His human knowledge during the period of his humiliation. This principle is virtually acknowledged by St. Paul, not merely in the well-known words I have quoted from his Epistle to the Philippians, but in a remarkable passage of his second Epistle to the Corinthians: "Even if we have known Christ Himself after the flesh"—if we have been personally acquainted with Him whilst He was on earth in the days of His weakness (as possibly some of the Jewish Christians who visited

Corinth may have been, and have grounded a claim of superiority on this merely mundane acquaintance), "yet now we know Him so no more." Why, except because during His earthly sojourn He was still imperfect, and could not be the omnipotent and omniscient Ruler and Providence of His Church which He became after His resurrection. The crass objections against Christianity which have lately been paraded in one of the monthly magazines with such an air of triumph are simply due to ignorance of what Christianity really is; it is coarseness of mental fibre rather than any passion for mental clearness that has produced them, and they only evince incapacity of dealing with a subject that requires humility of mind and delicacy of thought. It is a very curious and impressive warning against the drift of modern opinion in matters of education, which is the substitution of natural for mental science, that Darwin's absorption in natural science had made him incapable of enjoying poetry; that having appreciated Shakespeare in his youth, he had lost all relish for him in his old age. His mind had become warped and contracted by the contraction of his studies. But Christianity has nothing to fear from assaults originating in narrowed views and imperfect training; it may possibly be extinguished in the bosoms of those who have not received what is most fittingly denominated a liberal education, of those to whom the phenomenal world is everything and the mental world is nothing; but there will always be a remnant who will not be content with such a miserable travesty of education as some modern scientists would force upon us, and whilst such a remnant shall exist, religion will be safe.

Let me sum up. To use Christ's authority as decisive on matters of science, or history, or criticism, as has been lately done by a great English preacher, or to use supposed discoveries in science, or history, or criticism, for the purpose of discrediting Christ's authority, as a populariser of science has lately done, is to entirely misconceive the purpose for which Christ came; and further, it is to misapprehend or deny the doctrine of the Church regarding His dual nature. If He grew in wisdom as well as stature, then His wisdom must at one time of His life have been imperfect. The omniscience which belongs to the Second Person of the Trinity, taken by Himself, He laid aside when He took flesh in the Virgin's womb. Nor can we specify any era of His life on earth previous to His resurrection at which that omniscience can be supposed to have reverted to Him—any era until He was again glorified by His Father with the glory which He had with Him before the world was. An era is, indeed, fixed by St. Paul in a remarkable passage of his Epistle to the Colossians, at which our Lord stripped off from Himself (in the phrase of the original) the influence of the principalities and powers of evil, and for ever discarded the liability to all further temptation and to all furthersuffering. This was done when He triumphed on the Cross. But till that time, and the glory that followed His resurrection and ascension, and which so transfigured His body that St. John, beholding it in a vision, fell down as one dead before its awful splendour—till that time our Saviour was in the state of humiliation, and one part of that humiliation consisted in His having emptied Himself of every divine prerogative inconsistent with the limitations of mind as well as of body which pertain to our present earthly state. This is the doctrine of the Incarnation, a great and inscrutable mystery; yet, perhaps, a mystery not greater than that of the union of the rational with the animal in man, and of the limitations imposed by the animal upon the rational in man. On all sides we are encompassed by mysteries; they cannot be got rid of by the coarse expedient of denying them. Our Lord came to teach, not geology, nor zoology, nor criticism, nor history; not to decipher cuneiform inscriptions, or explain hieroglyphics, not to give us, in a word, any information which we could well gain by our unaided faculties, but truths which no natural faculty of ours could discover. He came, not to deliver scientific lectures upon the deluge, or critical disquisitions on the Pentateuch or Psalter, but to tell us the mind of God, in doing which He never shrank from contradicting the Mosaic legislation when that legislation was obsolete. And His incidental allusions to Jewish history and literature were no more intended to vouch for that history in all its particulars than our own use of inaccurate phraseology, when we speak of the rising and setting of the sun, is intended to declare that we believe in the Ptolemic system of astronomy. So, again, nothing whatever depends on the question whether the book of Jonah be a history or an apologue, nor on the question whether Job was a real personage or a typical representation of severe temptation aggravated by the narrow theology of his time, as embodied in the three friends who fancied they were defending God by their envenomed accusations of his servant. Whether the doctrine be taught by fact or by fiction, it is the same in either case. The resurrection of the Saviour is as much foreshadowed by the apologue as by the history of Jonah. The sudden outburst, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," is equally full of comfort and instruction, whether the poem, of which it forms the climax, be a product of inspired and speculative imagination, or whether it is based on actual facts in the life of some old Arab chief. Jesus was not a mere man. How, indeed, He could have ever been conceived as such passes my comprehension. But neither was He mere God, an idea which deprives His life of all meaning, and turns the Gospel into an acted lie. His knowledge of external things must have been gradually acquired by such methods as are open to men in general.

The Spirit which was poured on Him at His baptism is in itself a declaration that He was man with human needs, for as God He would not have needed its descent, and that Spirit was not the Spirit of anticipated scientific discovery or critical research—anachronisms that would only have thrown difficulties in His way, and probably wrecked His mission with a generation wholly unripe for such disclosures, but the spirit of wisdom and holiness, of absolute surrender to the will of His heavenly Father, of absolute coincidence with the mind of God, and therefore we are not to seek in His utterances authoritative decisions on moot points of history and criticism, but eternal principles of action. He pierced at once to the real drift, the eternal significance of the legislation, the poetry, the philosophy, the history of the Old Testament, but the outer shell, the husk in which that kernel of divine instruction was lodged, it was not His province to investigate; nor may we, therefore, either forbid or bias investigation and research into the nature and texture of the Old Testament by quoting an authority which has no relevancy to such questions, and was never meant to touch them. For sound doctrine as to Christ's dual nature is valuable, not merely because it secures Christ's real authority from pseudo-scientific attacks, it is quite as valuable because it guarantees to the true votaries of science and of history the free and uncensured exercise of those faculties which God hath given them. True science and true religion can never be enemies. But when science is shackled in the supposed interests of religion, as it was two centuries ago in the Catholic countries, or when science is biassed, as in some cases it certainly has been, by the attempt to employ it against religion; when we find on one side a ban laid by theology on science, as though the knowledge of God's works were inconsistent with sincere acceptance of God's will; or on the other hand, when we find a scientific investigator exulting in his supposed discoveries being used as an engine to overthrow Christianity, we must keep carefully aloof from either tendency. For either tendency will falsify science on the one hand, or religion on the other. Which of the two, false theology or false science, is most to be deprecated it is difficult to say, though in these days false science is, perhaps, the most mischievous. The men who pursue science, or what is popularly called such, in a spirit of hostility to religion can hardly be trusted as to the conclusions they arrive at, or the discoveries they suppose themselves to make. They are possessed by exactly the same spirit which animated the Inquisitors who persecuted Galileo. It is well for them and us that they neither are likely to be tempted as Galileo was, nor have the power to persecute which the Inquisitors enjoyed.

Let us, then, avoid the coarse mistakes in which ancient heretics and modern scientists agree; and whilst we commemorate the sufferings by which our Saviour was perfected, let us in heart and mind ascend with Him into that heaven of heavens where He now sits enthroned at the right hand of God, our eternal Mediator and Intercessor to whom all power has been given in heaven and earth, and who, when He comes again, will appear without sin and suffering unto salvation.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1890.

LAW AND LEAGUE IN IRELAND.

THE arrest of Irish members of Parliament and a number of National League organisers, on a charge of inciting and intimidating Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants into a refusal of their rents, brings back to public attention the Irish problem. For some time the labour movement had held the field in general interest, but the action of the Irish executive has brought our old friend the Plan of Campaign to the front once more. Exactly four years ago the very men who have just been arrested launched this "organised scheme of embezzlement," as Lord Salisbury pithily called it.

It was financed by a sum of £5,000, which Mr. W. O'Brien obtained in 1886, in Chicago, on the memorable occasion when he was delegate to the Irish Convention in that city. This important fact was elicited from Mr. O'Brien, in Cork, on July 27th, 1888, in cross-examination in a libel action which he brought against a Cork paper. It proves beyond all doubt the revolutionary character of the new land war which Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Dillon were to wage, and the object of which, as Mr. Redmond declared at Chicago, was to make the government of Ireland impossible. The Plan of Campaign is based on defiance of the law. It has been condemned by the High Court of Justice

in Ireland. It has been condemned by ecclesiastical as well as secular authorities. Even Mr. Parnell never approved the new departure, and its admitted results have been misery to the people who were duped into adopting its operation.

With the facts of the particular case in Tipperary which is now before the public most people are familiar. Those who may not know them should refer to the May number of *Murray's Magazine* (reprinted by the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, with illustrations), where a full account is given of the whole controversy. Suffice it to say that Mr. Smith-Barry has been the victim of an unprovoked attack from the leaders of the Plan of Campaign. Finding a combination arrayed against him, which refused to allow his tenants freedom of action in the payment of rent, he was compelled to have recourse to the law, with the result of further developments in outrage and boycotting.

Then came the reaction. The inhabitants of Tipperary seemed to be getting impatient of the despotism of the campaign local leaders, when Mr. Balfour took action, and the arrests were made. Much has been said as to the motives which prompted the action of the Irish executive. But the criticisms of the Parnellite party are self destructive. One section declares that Mr. Balfour's sole object was to stop the mission of the campaigners to America. But as that mission was avowedly to get fresh funds to keep the plan going, and as the arrests are loudly declared by another section of Nationalists to be the best possible methods of quickening the subscriptions, it is obvious that to stop the supplies was not Mr. Balfour's object. He knew as well as anyone the probable results of arrests. His real object was simply and solely to maintain the observance of the law, which, he contends, the campaigners have been deliberately and avowedly breaking by their incitement to the withholding of rent and to the promotion of boycotting and intimidation.

It is not always easy in Ireland to complete the investigation of a case, and to marshal proofs against popular leaders who wield immense emotional influence, and appeal for support to the sentiment, as well as the avarice, of the agricultural community. This, no doubt, was the reason for any delay in the proceedings, though, indeed, it savours of the ludicrous for law-breakers to complain that they are not given due notice by the executive of every intention to proceed against them.

Mr. Balfour's courage has always been equal to his convictions, and his success has been proportioned to his courage. Just three years ago the Chief Secretary, addressing a great meeting at Birmingham, pointed out that the law, even modified as it was by the Crimes Act, can never be so perfect a weapon in a society where a vast organisation is opposed to the law in every particular. It must happen that, tried under such circumstances, it will be found wanting in certain places where we should all desire that it should be perfected.

"But," said he, "do not suppose such passing and temporary failures are any reason whatever that the law as it at present exists should prove inadequate for the purpose for which we use it. I believe that its final triumph is absolutely certain. It is only necessary to continue its application to put down intimidation, and to meet every effort made by any one to cause the law to be broken. If that policy be pursued with courage—at all events I can promise that will not be wanting—I believe, without one shadow of doubt and hesitation that crime will be put down, the authority of the law will be vindicated, confidence that plant of slow growth will be gradually fostered, and in the train of confidence will come all the material blessings which confidence alone can bring."

Probably no statesman of modern times ever made a more successful or bolder forecast than the above. It has proved absolutely true. The Tipperary agitation was the last outbreak of lawlessness and intimidation with which the Irish executive had to deal. Slowly but surely Nemesis had been overtaking the Plan of Campaign. Law is triumphant everywhere else in Ireland.

Tipperary only proves the rule of the success in Mr. Balfour's policy. The *Times* of Saturday, September 20th, contained figures which prove conclusively the marvellous progress which Ireland has made since 1886, just a year before Mr. Balfour took up the reins of office. Pauperism has decreased. The statistics of crime speak eloquently of the majesty of the law, which is once more feared and respected. Where nearly 5,000 persons were wholly or partially boycotted, now only 150 suffer the pains and penalties of the National League.

Trade meanwhile has advanced rapidly under the ægis of a strong Government. There is no department of life in which substantial progress cannot be reported, and it is due entirely to the prompt, stern and vigorous administration of the law. No consideration of momentary unpopularity has turned or will turn Mr. Balfour from the path of duty which he has marked out for himself, and of which these arrests are only one more conspicuous illustration. The moral, or immoral sentiment of the hour, is nothing to Mr. Balfour. The sensationalism of newspaper editors like Mr. O'Brien, or the fluctuating passions of a Gladstonian mob have no terrors for him. The State exists, according to Mr. Balfour's view, for the protection of legal rights of all its members, and it was impossible for the Chief Secretary of Ireland to remain deaf much longer to the bitter cry of intimidated Tipperary. Hence the arrests. The case will be tried in the face of the world, and we shall be very much astonished if the facts do not bear out the belief that the Irish agitation is at its last gasp.

MR. J. B. MCCULLAGH, of the North Pacific Mission, has been admitted to deacon's orders by the Bishop of Caledonia.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

SIR,—Mr. Heber Evans has, I presume, brought his criticisms on Dr. Hobart's book to an end. Their chief fault is that they are on that book, and, from that book's medical standpoint, running in its groove and limited by its horizon. Hence to a student of the original Greek medical writings they are meagre and incomplete. They fail to grasp the important omissions, oversights and partialities of Dr. Hobart. They do not put the general use of ordinary medical terms in its true light; they do not show that unprofessional Greek writers of St. Luke's period used medical terminology more freely than St. Luke; they fail to exhibit Galen as using many of these so-called medical words, without explanation, when addressing tyros and the non-professional public; they omit other ways of perhaps equal importance, of giving point to his argument from the medical writings, and therefore they will remain jejune and unsatisfactory, as they now stand. It is a barren and dry land where no water is. Mr. Heber Evans cannot reasonably expect to convince Drs. Salmon, Plummer and their followers by arguments drawn only from the LXX.; the earlier and the later classics. They may fairly be allowed to know these writings as well as your esteemed correspondent. What they possibly do not know is the true relation of medical terminology to the ordinary current Greek of St. Luke's era. This, I maintain, can only be exhibited by one who is thoroughly conversant with the medical writers as well. Mr. Heber Evans will probably come round to this sensible view some future day.

But there is another point on which I demur to his criticisms. He gives *passim* as a reason why certain words cannot be considered as medical, that they are found in such classical writers as *Pindar*, *Thucydides*, *Xenophon*, *Aristotle*, etc., etc. Now we know that educated Greeks were familiar with *Homer* and *Æsop*, but have we any right to assume that St. Luke had read what we call the "classics"? Mr. Heber Evans is fond of referring to Winer; well, let us take Winer's opinion. He says (p. 46) . . . "the N.T. writers were not, like Philo and Josephus, acquainted with Greek literature." What is the use then of referring to the existence of certain words in the classics, if St. Luke had never read those classics? Or does Mr. Heber Evans insinuate that the said words were ordinary current coin in the days of St. Luke, because they were used (rarely) by certain writers some centuries before? In either case the argument breaks down.

In his letter of the 9th ult. Mr. Heber Evans slurs over somewhat the rather strong proof of the use of medical phraseology in the combination of δυσεντερία with πυρετοί (Acts xxviii. 8), and, dissociating the words which should be taken together, as they are more than once so taken in the *Epidemics* of Hippocrates, he is satisfied with dismissing πυρετοί, "in the plural in the case of one person," because forsooth Plato uses τεταρταῖοι πυρετοί, in his *Timæus*. He does not show that this Greek for *quartain fevers* is used by Plato of a single individual's case—parenthetically I may add that I do not think that it was so used medically either—but the point I wish to make s that there is no proof whatever that St. Luke, or for the matter of that his master, St. Paul, was at all acquainted with the writings of Plato. There is not the least trace in their compositions of such an acquaintance, and the fact that the plural form, πυρετοί, occurs in Plato is nothing to the point that St. Luke uses the word in the plural also, much less that he uses it, like Hippocrates, combined with δυσεντερία. Mr. Heber Evans' argument cannot surely satisfy himself, nor of course your readers.

There are also a number of other references to the Greek classical writings, which should be struck out of the argument to make it consistent. On the other hand, the references to Josephus, Philo, Plutarch and the later classics generally should remain, but only on the ground that they presumably use the current Greek language of the Evangelist's age.

Incidentally I cannot pass by without a protest the statement that ἀνάληψις, in St. Luke ix. 51, refers to the ascension of Christ. I know that ecclesiastical writers, like Clement of Alexandria, use ἀνάληψις in that sense frequently. But, before the Ascension, the word was used with very different meanings, and here the more natural meaning is not that of ascending into heaven, for which the time had not fully come, as the text asserts, but of ascending to the highlands of Jerusalem. The word which St. Luke uses in the Gospel for being carried up into heaven is ἀναφέρεσθαι, and besides, it seems an anachronism to antedate the idea of ascension, when as yet the disciples knew not of a resurrection from the dead. F. T. P.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—In the PULPIT of the 20th inst., Mr. Murphy charges Mr. Sandlands with a "misconception" in his statements with regard to the doctrine of Justification, as held by the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

The former teaches, as Mr. Sandlands had said, that "the mean of salvation so far as man is concerned is faith; the latter, that it is works."

Mr. Murphy now says, that the Romish doctrine of justification by works is true! and quotes St. Paul and St. James, to show that justification by faith and justification by works are *both* taught. But it is Mr. Murphy himself who is under the misconception. He confounds the justification of a *sinner*, with the justification of a *believer*. The former takes place by faith in the merit of Christ alone; the latter, either now, or at the Judgment Day, is by faith producing *justifying* works. The Thirteenth Article of our Church says that "works done *before* the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of His Spirit, are *not pleasant* to God, forasmuch as they spring not of *faith* in Jesus Christ."

Therefore, the works by which a man is justified, are as the Twelfth Article says, those "good works, which are the *fruits* of *faith*, and *follow after justification*." Hence *before* a person can be justified by works he must have been justified by faith. St. James knew that *without* faith it was impossible to please God at *any* time, hence he is careful to show its presence in those works by which Abraham was justified. "Thou seest how *faith wrought* with his *works*, and by works was faith made perfect." That is, his works, on the occasion referred to, were justifying works, because a justifying faith "*wrought*" them; and that justifying faith received its "*perfection*" from those justifying works.

Abraham was justified many years *before* he is said to have been justified by works.

There is no such thing in the world, nor is there any such doctrine in the Bible, as that a man can be justified by works which have not sprung from a previously existing justifying faith.

Hence we see the great impropriety of saying, that "justification by faith is never taught in immediate connection with judgment." R. DONALDSON.

September 23rd, 1890.

ATTEMPTS TO CLEAR THE ATMOSPHERE.—III.

SIR,—In continuing my efforts to search for the truth, in relation to the opinions of the early Church, and the real meaning of some texts of paramount importance, I will quote a statement by Dr. Fisher of Yale University, in his "History of the Christian Church." "In the fourth century, restorationism, or the ultimate salvation of all was the opinion of theologians as eminent as Gregory of Nyassa, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and was accepted less definitively by Gregory Nazianzen. These held with Origen, that the design of punishment is to reform. The crusade against Origen's teaching included restorationism among its objects of attack. From the beginning of the fifth century, this doctrine, which was withstood by Augustin, was discarded." I may also bring forward the testimony of another American writer, Dr. Edward Beecher, in his "History of opinions on the doctrine of Retribution," that, "of the six early theological schools, the influence of four was in favour of universal restoration."

I can see no reason to suppose that the doctrine of eternal punishment would have been accepted by the Church, and held for many centuries, if freedom of discussion had not been suppressed. Dean Plumptre justly says, in his "Spirits in Prison," part iv.: "So the dark shadow of Augustin fell on the theology of the Western Church, and condemned its thoughts of the love of God, to many centuries of disastrous twilight." I do not believe, however, that the arguments employed by Augustin could have produced those disastrous effects, so long as those who differed from him were allowed to state their objections. Dr. Farrar says, in "Mercy and Judgment," chap. ix.: "It would have been far better for the Church, if her mediæval admiration of Augustin had been less blind, and if her sense of his fallibility, and the many limitations of his knowledge, and intellectual powers had been more decided." Other writers, while extolling the splendour of his genius, discern serious defects in the more solid mental faculties. It was his fatal influence with the Imperial power, which procured the imposition of severe penalties against all who disputed the correctness of his theological views. That was the crushing blow which enslaved Christendom for so many centuries. It seems to me very strange that I have not observed any clear reference to the important fact of forcible suppression in the writings of Dr. Farrar and Dr. Plumptre.

If the mass of Christians in modern times had understood that the Augustinian theology had been established by physical force, they could hardly have clung to it with so much tenacity. Milman, in his "History of Christianity," says: "The popular theology of most of the Protestant sects is but a modified Augustinianism . . . . worked up into a still more rigid and uncompromising system by the severe intellect of Calvin."

It is surprising to me that Dr. Pusey, who certainly had access to the best sources of information, and who apparently was a true and sincere Christian, brings forward as an irresistible argument for the doctrine of endless misery that the Saviour, when He spoke the words supposed to teach that doctrine, knew that they would be so interpreted, by "millions upon millions of Christians, century after century." Not a word does he say about the forcible suppression of opposing opinions. So likewise the Biographical Dictionary, edited by Smith and Wace, gives us an account of Augustin, by E. de Pressensé, in which the action of the Emperor Honorius, in issuing edicts of compulsion and repression, is softly and blandly designated as the *support* of Honorius, and the *influence* of Honorius, without any hint as to repressive measures.

With such modern instances in view, of partial truth producing false impressions, and so employed by good and pious men, it becomes less difficult to believe that some of the early fathers considered it a duty, not only to suppress truths, but deliberately to make false statements, if they sincerely believed the interests of religion would be promoted thereby. The inconsistent teaching of some among them concerning the destinies of the intelligent creation may be accounted for in that way. They were surrounded by monsters of cruelty and iniquity, and they thought the most highly wrought images of terror were absolutely necessary as correctives and deterrents.

But it may justly be said that the opinions of men, ancient or modern, are not of paramount importance to us. It may be asserted, and has been asserted in the pages of the PULPIT quite recently, that the doctrine of eternal punishment is clearly declared in the Sacred Volume. I may be allowed to mention in regard to my own experience, that in my youth I was removed from opportunities of hearing sermons, and was left alone with the Bible for more than ten years, and read it through several times. At the end of that period, more than thirty years ago, an irresistible conviction came to me, and has never left me since, that the whole tenor of the Holy Scriptures indicates the firm design of God to vanquish all evil by the superior energy of moral good emanating from Himself with gradually increasing power. J. B.

Canonbury, 13th September, 1890.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barton, Rev. C. H., Vicar of Waterhouse, Durham ; Vicar of St. Mary's, Sowerby, Halifax.
Bell, Rev. Colin Edward Beever, M.A., Succentor of Liverpool Cathedral ; Precentor of Liverpool Cathedral.
Blofield, Rev. Robert Singleton, M.A., Vicar of Ormesby-with-Scratby, Norfolk ; Surrogate in the Diocese of Norwich.
Bowers, Rev. John P. A., M.A., Diocesan Missioner ; Canon of Rochester Cathedral.
Byron, Rev. Hon. William, M.A., Rector of Trowell, Notts.
Dawson, Rev. George Allen, Senior Curate of Tideswell ; Vicar King Sterndale, near Buxton.
Churchill, Rev. E. B. C., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Portsea ; Rector of Ashmansworth, Hants.
Dolphin, Rev. John Maxmilian, B.A., Vicar of Long Eaton, Derbyshire.
Ducket, Rev. Edward A., M.A., Senior Curate of Twerton-on-Avon ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Taunton.
Dunkin, Rev. Henry, M.A., Head Master of the Dorset County School, Dorchester ; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Edlestone, Rev. Alfred Blakey, Curate of Burnley ; Vicar of the new church of St. Alban's, Burnley.
Hamer, Rev. T. E., M.A., Rector of Darlaston ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Lichfield.
Jenkins, Rev. Thomas, Rector of Caerphilly ; Rural Dean of the North-Eastern Division of Llandaff Upper Deanery.
Lomax, Rev. Ernest William, Chaplain of University College, Oxford ; Vicar of Yarnton, Oxon.
Majendie, Rev. Severne A., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Graham-street, Pimlico ; Vicar of Cranborne St. Giles.
Mallinder, Rev. J. H., Curate of St. Martin's, Lincoln ; Vicar of Marton, near Gainsborough.
Marsh, Rev. W., B.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Huddersfield ; Vice-Principal of the Gloucester Theological College.
May, Rev. Edmund Alexander, Vicar of Mudford, Somersetshire.
Owen, Rev. Robert, B.A., Vicar of Bagillt, Flintshire.
Page, Rev. Edward, M.A., Curate of Edgbaston ; Rector of Whitchurch, Ross, Herefordshire.
Phillips, Rev. F. G. A., M.A., Curate of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, London ; Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Northwich.
Rees, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Cardiff ; Vicar of Pontlottyn, Glamorganshire.
Riley, Rev. Edward, M.A., Chaplain Royal Navy.
Robinson, Rev. Arthur W., M.A., Curate of All Hallows, Barking ; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Wakefield.
Robinson, Rev. George, Chaplain of the French Hospital, London ; Chaplain of the Church of the Angels, Garvanza, Los Angeles, California.
Saunders, Rev. Sidney Charles, M.A., Vicar of Cadmore End, Oxon.
Shaw, Rev. W. H., Rector of Stapleton, Bristol.
Shore, Rev. Teignmouth, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty ; Chaplain of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem.
Smith, Rev. Charles Penswick, Vicar of Coddington, Notts.
Smith, Rev. David George Fee, Vicar of Paul's, Liverpool ; Succentor of Liverpool Cathedral.
Vaughan, Rev. Wycliffe, M.A., Curate of St. Bridget's, Chester; Vicar of St. James's, Birkenhead.
Walker, Rev. J., Senior Curate of Gainsborough ; Curate-in-Charge of Empingham, near Stamford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beaumont, Rev. Reginald E., of Newsham Hall, Winston-on-Tees, on the 22nd inst.
Carpenter, Rev. Philip, Vicar of the parish, at the Vicarage, Codsall, Wolverhampton, aged 35.
Dayman, Rev. Phillipps Donnithorne, formerly Vicar of Poundstock, at Millbrook, Southampton, on the 24th inst., aged 77.
Forster, Rev. Henry Brooks, Hon. Canon of Gloucester Cathedral, at Henley-on-Thames, on the 23rd ult., aged 82.
Govett, Rev. John Clement, late Rector of Shepperton, Middlesex, at Richmond, Surrey, on the 27th ult.
Llewellin, Rev. John Cleeves, Vicar of Trevethin, Monmouthshire, on the 22nd ult., aged 64.
Meade, Rev. de Courcy, late Rector of Tockenham, at 13, Great Bedford-street, Bath, on the 26th ult., aged 66.
Smyth, Rev. Thomas Graham, on the 28th ult., in his 80th year.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CORBAN.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, Canon of Manchester, late Vicar of Penwortham.

Sermon Preached in the Temple, Deauville, on Sunday, September 7th, 1890.

"For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free. And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother. Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered; and many such like things do ye."—Mark vii. 10, 11, 12, 13.

THE Hebrew word Corban, pronounced in this text by our Saviour, is one very largely used in the Levitical law. It means, literally, a thing brought near to God, as an offering to Him, and it was applied very widely and generally to all the gifts that were brought to the Tabernacle or Temple as an offering to Him, to Whom those places of worship were dedicated. The animals that were brought to be slain as sacrifices, the firstlings and the tithes, which became the perquisites of the priests and Levites, and any free-will offerings that the Israelites might make, over and above those which the law demanded, were all Corbans.

In the text, the word seems to refer to an offering of the last-named class. A Jewish son or daughter was taught by his spiritual guides that he might commute his filial duties by presenting an offering to the worship or service, to the Church, or Temple, or ministry of God, and that in return for this payment he need not, and (if the word used is to be taken literally) he even ought not, to honour, obey, or serve his parents.

This error of those who sate in Moses' seat, as the representatives of God's first and most ancient Israelitish Church, gave occasion to one of our Lord's greatest, and deepest, and most vital utterances. When stated in the simplest and clearest terms, that utterance of his amounts to this: That a man's natural duties, as child to parents, as parent to children (and we may here include the other duties, which the institution of the family involves, of husband and wife, of brotherhood and of sisterhood), are the first of all the ordinances of God, and stand far above all voluntary obligations, that any person may take upon himself, so that if any acts of presumed self-devotion prevent, or interfere with, the fulfilment of those natural duties, the tradition which approves such acts makes void the law of God itself.

Now it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this declaration of our Lord in support of the first and most elementary of all our ties—the family connection, and the sacred duties which that connection involves. This is an eternal subject, reaching down to the very bottom of all the relations between man and man. And it is also a present day subject, for there are too many examples in contemporary life of the loosening of the first natural ties, in some cases through mere worldliness and selfishness, and in others through mistaken ideas of religious duty. Would it be too much to ask a few minutes serious attention to this subject? Even admitting the prevailing view, that nothing is to be expected from the pulpit, except empty rhetoric, from which nothing can be really learnt, it would be well if we could all be led to reflect seriously for a few moments, upon those nearest obligations, in which we are all of us more or less involved, and which none of us, perhaps, discharges too well.

What our Saviour has taught us in the text is, that our natural duties stand on a higher plane than any of our other duties whatever—higher especially than those duties which we are used to call religious ones, but which have not really any right to the name—those which we owe to our ecclesiastical teachers, to our Church, or to our creed, or to any obligations that we may have taken upon ourselves to any of these authorities.

Is it not a fact that, as has been already said, these family duties stand upon the highest plane of all? Our Lord introduced his doctrine with the words, "Moses said," and in the ancient document to which he referred, The Decalogue, that doctrine claims a still higher sanction. "God spake these words, and said." And He himself adopts these latter words, when he calls them a commandment of God. Thus he quotes them as a matter of direct revelation from God.

But they do not depend upon revelation only. Revelation is a historical event, resting on historical evidence, which many persons do not think conclusive; and not a few doubt whether a revelation has ever taken place. But family duties rest upon a foundation, that was firmly laid, long before any historical revelation was made by God to man. They rest on a physical relation, which is the undoubted work of our Creator. We need but to assume the two most elementary facts of religion, that God exists, and that He is our Creator; then it follows that the nature which we find within us, and the connections in which we find ourselves involved, are His work. The family duties follow at once from that assumption, and establish and commend themselves. If only there be a God above us, He has certainly said to every child, Honour thy father and mother, and to every parent, Care

diligently and lovingly for thy child, long before He spoke from Sinai, or Moses spoke to Israel, or Jesus Christ to us.

But even that is not quite the last word to be said on this matter. There are some who deny the being of a God, some who cannot quite make up their minds whether there is a God or no, some who maintain that whether He exists or not is a thing absolutely unknowable by man. But even for these orphan souls, who have become bereaved of their Heavenly Father, the family ties remain as sacred things. Those ties assert themselves in those instincts which have been formed in us—no man of science can positively tell us how; and in that conscience which, however it may have been developed, certainly exists in us, and asserts and commands, and, when it is disobeyed, condemns and punishes. For those who cannot hear any voice of God speaking in all the universe, these obligations are at least the command of holy nature, the one object of their reverence and awe.

Can then anything be imagined firmer and deeper than the foundation on which these duties rest? To whatever sect of Christians you belong, whether you are Christian or not, a believer or an unbeliever, these still remain for you unshaken. To the Jew they are a command of Moses, or of Elohim or Jehovah (which you will), to the Christian a command of Christ—a command of God to those who believe in Him, and of nature to those to whom she is the only Deity.

Our Saviour, in the text, asserts the sacredness of these duties in opposition to any mere ecclesiastical commands or ordinances, or any mere ecclesiastical obligations that a person may voluntarily take upon himself. The child may not say, I will devote to God's direct worship and service the time, the labour, the loving service which I owe to my parents. Nor may the parent say, I will spend my time and strength in worshipping God, instead of in caring for, and tending, and watching over my child. God accepts no such service from us, but regards it as a violation of His law.

The reasonable ground on which this assertion of His is founded is as clear as light. It has already been shown that the common family duties, though asserted by revelation, are not dependent upon it; that, though involved and included in our belief in God, they are not dependent even upon that elementary faith; that they are actually facts of nature, which no one in his senses can deny.

Compare that solid basis with that on which any Corban—any special act of self-devotion may rest. Suppose, let us say, a person who has domestic duties at home to parents or to children says, I feel a special call from God to devote myself to His work elsewhere—to convert negroes in Africa, or to instruct Indian women in Zenanas, or to tend lepers in the Sandwich Islands or at the Cape of Good Hope; and my spiritual guides, whom I have consulted, express the highest approbation of this projected self-devotion, the question rises at once: Is it not a very doubtful thing whether this inward impulse, that you feel in your heart and mind, is really from God? And may not your spiritual guides, perhaps, be mistaken in the encouragement that they give you? Human minds often deceive themselves, especially enthusiastic ones. Spiritual guides are often mistaken, especially over-zealous ones. But the command to fulfil the family duties is absolutely infallible, resting, as it does, on the triple authority of revelation, and of God, and of nature. No religious obligation must ever be undertaken which supersedes, or dispenses from, these.

And now permit me to illustrate this error of the Pharisees, and our Lord's correction of it, by examples drawn from Christian times. I could quote examples quite contemporary, but it is better not, when distant ones have quite equal force. The two which I am about to give are of persons whom I knew forty and fifty years ago. I remember a lady who was young about the same time that I was myself. She was the only daughter of an old clergyman and his wife, the only object of their daily affection, who might, if she would, have made all the brightness of their home. But she had a sore trial to bear in the absolute want of all personal attractiveness. She was so plain that no one who met her for the first time could help remarking the defect. This brought on in her a feeling of general discontent, which made her very bad to live with at home. Then she professed a call to join a sisterhood—institutions which were then newly beginning—and she left her parents in their old age, and the parish duties, which were quite sufficient to give her ample charitable employment, in order to make what she fancied to be an offering of herself to God. That was precisely Corban, the error of the Pharisees, and its deep inner source was selfishness and want of love.

Let me quote one more example of much nobler conduct remembered from the days of my own earliest youth. It was another young lady, a member of a distinguished Roman Catholic family, but of a younger branch, who were poor. She was the eldest daughter in a large family of girls, and, in her earliest days, she imbibed a strong inclination for convent life. But she was not permitted to follow it. Her mother, who was a common-place woman of the worldly devout kind, which I suppose exists still as it did fifty years ago, wanted her to assist in the education of the younger daughters. And she did so. We, who were about five or six years younger than she, used to pity her as a victim, which she was, and a most meek and patient one. She submitted to be a sort of governess in her own home, and went uncomplainingly through the work that her parents imposed on her, which lasted out many years; and then she found she was no longer wanted at home, and she followed her first inclination. There was no sinful Corban there. The

natural duties were performed nobly and self-denyingly, and not till they were completed was the special call (if it was a call) obeyed.

Both these examples are taken, as you see, out of the practice of the monastic system; and that system has very much to answer for in the weakening and breaking up of domestic ties. The evil of it is, that its votaries have always encouraged the idea that special calls can possibly release persons from those simplest duties which God lays on us through nature. In the fourth century after Christ, when that system first came into vogue among Christians, having originated in the East, far beyond Christendom, and centuries before the birth of Christ, many parents abandoned their children in order to devote themselves, as they thought, more exclusively to God. I know of two very famous personages in ecclesiastical history, each of them wealthy and noble ladies of Rome, and each young widows with one little boy apiece, who, being infected with the monastic enthusiasm, entrusted their children to the guardianship of officials, and then left them. One of them is praised by a great religious authority of the time for the courage with which she supported the tears of her little boy, when she parted with him for the last time. That abandonment of maternal duty is a more dreadful Corban than any sacrifice of filial duty from a child to a parent. I think there are no examples of it now. We hear still of parents neglecting their children in order to devote themselves to fashionable dissipation—a still more wicked thing; but I do not remember ever to have known of one, who abandoned them in deference to an imagined religious call.

We have now, I think, completed the direct explanation and illustration of our Saviour's words. But there is one other point, incidentally noticed by Him here, which ought not be passed by.

If it be true that it is so great an offence to neglect family duties, even when a person imagines himself to have received a call from God to work for Him in other ways, how much greater must be the condemnation, when the motive for neglecting those duties is unmixed selfishness!

We are often told by comic writers jocularly, and by moralists seriously, that filial duty and respect are growing out of date. Is there really any truth in this? If it were so, it would be a very serious matter, for all the conservative forces of society are summed up in the Fifth Commandment; and, if that fall into neglect, society must fall to pieces, as the Roman world did in that period which I quoted a while ago, when it was being sapped on the one side by immorality, and on the other by monasticism.

The last of the Hebrew prophets, in the last words of the Old Testament, said that the great work of the Lord's forerunner would be to restore neglected family duties—"To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers." And then he adds the solemn warning, "Lest I come and smite the earth with a curse"—that curse of entire dissolution, which befel the ancient world in the fifth century, and which must befal every society, which breaks or neglects the first natural laws upon which all society is based.

Let us ask once more, Is there any need in our time of repeating and enforcing this caution?

Amongst the labouring class in England, with whose case I am personally most familiar, there is undoubtedly a considerable decay of filial duty and respect. This results to a great extent from the diffusion of superficial education. A child finds himself, through the advantages, which his parents' self-denial have procured for him, on a higher position in some respects than they are. He can read and write with facility, he has a smattering of history and geography, and some few small accomplishments. And he often thinks himself superior to those, who are above him in all essential points, especially in that gentle wisdom which only comes from experience, and who are almost always better workmen than he at their manual trades.

It is not impossible that there may be something analogous to this in the educated classes also. It is well for them to reflect upon this subject seriously, and never to forget that, of all possible duties, the family duties have the highest sanction, and the first claim. Unless they are done rightly, nothing can go well in the State, or in the Church, or in the home, or in the individual life. If these be neglected or postponed, religious heroism is a Corban, disclaimed and rejected by Him to whom it is offered. "Though I give all my goods to feed the poor, and give my body to be burned, and have not *love*, it profiteth me nothing." And if loveless heroism is thus rejected, what must be said of loveless egotism?

Of all the forms of human love, those affections which bind the family together are the first and the most divine. Each family is God's school of self-denial, though it may be perverted into the devil's school of selfishness. Let us each make our own true to the purpose for which our Creator founded it as the first and holiest of all his institutions.

THE *English Churchman* has much pleasure in directing attention to the fact that the Rev. Wilfrid H. Isaacs, B.A., of King's College, Cambridge, has been appointed head master of Trent College, which was founded upon Evangelical principles. "Mr. Isaacs was a mathematical scholar of Rugby, classical exhibitioner of King's College, and took a First Class in the Classical Tripos at Cambridge, so that his attainments are of a high order; and above all this he is well known as a devoted Christian and an intelligent advocate of Evangelical principles in the Church of England." He is the only son of the Rev. A. A. Isaacs, of Leicester.

THE GIRLS' FRIENDLY SOCIETY.

By the Rt. Rev. W. PAKENHAM WALSH, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin.

Sermon Preached in St. Canice's Cathedral, Kilkenny, on the Sixth Annual Festival of the above Society, August 19th, 1890.

"And the Syrians had gone out by companies, and had brought away captive out of the land of Israel a little maid; and she waited on Naaman's wife. And she said unto her mistress, Would God, my lord were with the prophet that is in Samaria! for he would recover him of his leprosy." — 2 Kings v. 2, 3.

THE chapter which contains this brief anecdote about the little captive maid is filled with an account of illustrious persons and of remarkable events. We have the story of two kings and a record of their correspondence; we have the history of a great and victorious general, and a notice of his wife; we have the record of a great prophet, and of two of his wonderful miracles; in fact, we have a thrilling narrative studded with eminent names and memorable deeds. But what I would especially call your attention to is the fact that the whole narrative circles round a young girl, whose very name is unknown, who occupied a comparatively obscure position in life, who had her trials and her difficulties to encounter in the midst of strangers, but who was, nevertheless, the very hinge and mainspring of the wonderful events which are here narrated. But for her we never should have heard of Naaman the Syrian; but for her the King of Syria would never have heard of Elisha the prophet; but for her the victorious general would never have been healed of his leprosy; but for her he never would have renounced the idols of his country, or learned to worship the only true God. The history of that little maid, amidst her sorrows and her trials, was being shaped by the overruling hand of God for His own glory, and the good of her fellow-creatures. Little did she dream, when carried away captive from the home she loved, and consigned to servitude in a strange and heathen land, that the God of her fathers, whom she had been taught to fear and love was preparing for her opportunities of usefulness to men, and a sphere for loving service for Himself. And now, though her name has not come down to us, her example has survived through all the centuries, and may well form a subject for our thoughtful consideration at this annual gathering of our Girls' Friendly Society. It is full of lessons for us all, and especially for you, my dear young people—lessons of faith and hope and charity, which may both instruct us in our duties and encourage us in our religious principles. And, first of all, does not her simple but beautiful story tell us that none of us are too young, too humble, too insignificant, too poor, to unlearned, to be employed in the service of God; that if only we seek His blessing, and follow the precepts that He has laid down for us, we may be useful beyond what we ourselves could possibly conceive. There is sometimes a great temptation to think that because we cannot do much for God therefore it is needless or unnecessary or impossible, to do anything—that our obscurity, or our feebleness, or our youth, excuses us from duty. Let the little captive maid remind us that it is not in doing great things, but in doing little things, that our duty mainly consists. God has assigned to each of us our place, just as He gave her situation in Naaman's household to this Israelitish girl. "She waited on Naaman's wife," and in that lowly, daily, ordinary, service she brought glory to God. And so it may be with each of you. It may be in the home where God has left you; it may be in the distant household to which he has transferred you; it may be in some employment or occupation which He has opened out to you—wherever it is, and whatever it is, learn, in the words of the Catechism, and by God's help, "to do your duty in that state of life to which He is pleased to call you." Look on the simple and every day duties of your position as service to be rendered to the Lord Himself. This will exalt and sanctify them; this will render them happier and easier for yourself; this too will prepare the way, if such be His gracions will, for higher and more distinctive service. Then learn another lesson from the "little maid"—might I not rather call her "the Friendly Girl of the Old Testament"? Her duties were not discharged merely from a sense of duty, or in any cold conventional spirit. They were evidently marked by tenderness and consideration. She saw that her master's sickness was the one great sorrow that darkened the family home, the one great trial that beclouded its life, and she wished that if possible that sorrow could be removed. Her words to her mistress are full of feeling and sympathy. "Would God my Lord were with the prophet that is in Samaria! for He would recover him of his leprosy." What a new light such words throw upon her own character? If ever there was a girl who had the temptation to render as little service as possible to her employer, it was she—a captive and a slave, torn from her own home and parents, forced against her will into the servitude of strangers, probably despised by those around her—and yet no angry passions, no sulky discontent, no surly speeches, no morbid brooding over her own grievances, checked the overflow of her generous compassion and loving sympathy. How conduct like that would render every little service that she rendered more acceptable; how it would raise not only her, but the religion that she professed in the estimation of all around her; how it would honour the Lord in that heathen household. Need I enforce the lesson upon each and all of you? Is it not the lesson of Christ and of His Gospel? Is

it not the practical fulfilment of that New Testament command, "By love serve one another"? Is it not the embodiment of that beautiful exhortation upon which I once addressed you from this place—"Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report—if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise—think on these things." Oh! how much of power and beauty there is in the winningness and tenderness of love—in kindly words, in considerate thoughts, in helpful sympathies? Does not the conduct of this dear girl seem to remind us of the verse that is the motto of our society—"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ"? But there is another and a deeper lesson to be learned from "the little maid." Piety lay at the root both of her duties and her kindnesses. Why did she speak these words at all? Because she had faith in the power of God. She had been early instructed, as a Jewish child, in the Holy Scriptures. She had early learned about the Lord of hosts, and about His prophets. She had doubtless heard in her own land of God's mighty works and of Elisha's miracles. She doubtless knew how the widow's oil was multiplied; she doubtless heard how the lady's son at Shunem had been raised from the dead; she had heard of these and other proofs of the mighty power of God by His servants. She believed that the Lord God of Israel could heal her master, and she hoped that the prophet would have the loving kindness to accomplish it. And this faith in her young heart was the more remarkable because no like miracle had been performed in her day. To this point our Lord Himself called particular attention when preaching in the Synagogue of Nazareth: "I tell you of a truth that many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet, and none of them were cleansed, saving Naaman, the Syrian." But though she had never heard of such a miracle having been performed by the prophet, her young heart was full of faith in the God of her fathers. She had not forgotten her religion, and she did not conceal her convictions now that she was far from home, and amongst strangers who might mock at her devotion. She "knew in whom she had believed," and she was not ashamed or afraid to confess Him before men. My dear young friends, take her as your example in all this, and especially when the duties of life and the calls of Providence remove you from home and its sacred influences. Enshrine in your inmost hearts the sacred truths of Holy Scripture which you have been learning. Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly. Let the precious gospel which you have learned at home, or in the Sunday School, be an abiding force and treasure in your breasts. Seek for grace to confess your Lord and Saviour before men, and never be ashamed of Him or of His truth. Honour Him even where He is dishonoured; acknowledge Him even where He is denied; and serve Him even where He is rejected or disowned. Mark the tone of prayerful piety in the language of "the little maid"—"Would God my lord were with the prophet that is in Samaria." Outwardly the words were addressed to her mistress as an expression of her sympathy and good wishes for her master; inwardly they were addressed to God as the utterance of her earnest prayer for his recovery. They really mean, "I would to God—it is my wish, my prayer to Him, that He would cure my master of his leprosy." It seems to tell us that she was a girl who was accustomed to pray, and thus to keep up communion with her God; and doubtless, as she brought the trials of her mistress and the sickness of her master before the throne of grace, so she brought her own needs and anxieties before it too. Alone, yet not alone, in that strange and heathen land, she felt at home with God; she knew that He was ever near, and that He was able to bless and to preserve her. She was the only one in that house who prayed; but she had learned the value of prayer, and she clave to the privilege as her comfort and her peace. It was a joy to herself; it brought a blessing to the family. And O! what a rich reward to her when she saw her master return from Samaria, not only with his flesh "come again to him like the flesh of a little child," and his leprosy cleansed, but with his heart renewed, his spirit weaned from idolatry, and resolved, by God's grace, from "henceforth to offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the Lord." I have often pictured to myself that altered home, with its voice of joy and health; with the sweet smile of tender joyfulness on the dear young face of that "Friendly Girl"; with the look of grateful thankfulness upon her master's and her mistress's countenance as they thought of all they owed to the Jewish maiden. And I have gone further, and have thought of that dear girl kneeling in devotion, side by side with the great captain of the host of Syria, to whose recovery she had been so instrumental; aye, and it may be side by side with the astonished and delighted mistress, who must have been won by her sympathy, and who possibly was also won to the service of the true God by the pious conduct of her little waiting-maid, and by the great goodness of the Lord Jehovah. My dear young friends, would you be happy and secure in your own hearts and lives? Would you be useful and a blessing to those around you? Then give your own hearts to God. Seek a personal interest in the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Ask Him to wash your sins away in His precious blood. Ask for His Holy Spirit to consecrate all your affections and all your powers to His honour and glory. Carry your religion with you wherever you go, and more especially when you leave the home of your childhood, and the

influences of pious friends and teachers. Keep up communion with God amidst your daily duties and occupations. Seek the best interests, and, as far as in you lies, try to advance the temporal and spiritual good of those around you. If you cannot speak to them for God, you can pray to Him on their behalf. If you cannot teach them by your words, you may at least instruct them silently by your lives. In doing this, and acting thus, you will be sure to obtain a blessing for yourselves, and you may be permitted to draw down rich blessings upon others. You will, by God's help, recommend religion to those who perhaps do not at present care for it, and you will strengthen the hands and hearts of those who truly love it. Fidelity in your duties, gentleness and kindness in your words and deeds, consideration for all around you, and loving service to any who may employ you; above all, the fear and love of God continually reigning in your hearts—these will make you what a "Friendly Girl" ought to be—these in their place and proportion will repeat and re-echo in your homes and in your neighbourhoods the sweet story of "the little maid that was of the land of Israel." These will fit and prepare you for usefulness and happiness in future days, when perhaps you may have homes and households of your own, and when you may look back upon these earlier days, and bless God for seasons and opportunities such as you enjoy to-day. May the Lord make each of you in your day and generation what the Lord would have you to be, and may this great and blessed Society be a help and encouragement to you in loving and serving Him.

DURING the last week or two the Bishop of Worcester and Mrs. Philpott have been quietly taking leave of the parishioners of Hartlebury, among whom they have lived for the last thirty years, and on Saturday they left Hartlebury Palace (the Bishop's official residence) for their new home at Cambridge. This is at the Elms, formerly the residence of Dr. Kennedy, though they stay a few days first with a relative at Cambridge.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1890.

CURATES.

SOME time ago we discussed the relative position of incumbent and curate, and it seemed obvious that the relationship was of a most extraordinary nature. This conclusion has been peculiarly borne out to us in a circumstance which came under our notice but a short time ago. The vicar of an important country church had handed over the charge of one of the two churches in his parish to one of his assistant clergy, a man of considerable experience and thorough competency, who continued to exercise his function there for a long period undisturbed. During these years the vicar was engaged in constant broils with his parishioners at the other church, and only succeeded in escaping the continuous strife by emptying his church and earning the dislike of all who knew him. After getting rid, in a disgraceful manner, of another curate who had stood by him all the time he had been engaged in conflict with his aggrieved parishioners, he at last turned his attention in a similar manner to his other church, and without cause, rhyme, or reason informed the before mentioned curate-in-charge that he had better leave, stating at the same time that he had nothing against him, but that he wished him to leave. That gentleman instead of at once complying, consulted a friend, who advised him to place the matter before the bishop, and, as a natural consequence, the episcopal permission to "cashier" the curate was not forthcoming; and this gentleman, amid much opposition, continues to do much good at his accustomed post. These facts are such as to raise very important issues in the mind of every un-

beneficed clergyman who has the misfortune to be working either with a man or in a place that he does not like. If the fault be not (as is often the the case) his own, he naturally asks himself, Am I bound to pander to the eccentricities of my vicar, or may I take what I believe to be the better course without running the risk of being cast ruthlessly on the mercy of a cold, pitiless world, and the knowledge that in such cases the bishop not only can, but will, interfere to protect his own licentiate, ought to give considerable relief? It has been often pointed out that one of the great advantages of our Church over other religious bodies is the fact that the clergy are not forced to pander to their people, but by being absolutely independent of them are able to be teachers in truth. This is, however, true for the most part only of incumbents, for the majority of curates labouring under the false impression that they can be dismissed at their vicar's will are kept in meek subjection to his every wish, which must surely be as deleterious to really good spiritual work as the desire of courting popularity would be. Again, in many churches with large staffs the senior curate is often far more really at the head of affairs than the vicar who is more or less ornamental, whilst the bulk of the work and responsibility falls upon his clerical adjutant, and we are of the impression that at least in such cases as these there ought to be an absolute security to the curate, and in fact we would strongly advocate that something in the nature of a freehold should be accorded to those assistant clergy who have been at work in the same parish more than two years. This we believe would not be subject to any more abuse than the present system, but would rather tend to vest the interest of every curate in his parish, and would enable the incumbent to place greater confidence in him.

It may be suggested that, after a period of say three years, any given curate might become utterly negligent, and, relying upon the security of his position, cease to fulfil his duties; but this, we maintain, would not be the case, inasmuch as he would be in precisely the same position as the negligent incumbent, and therefore would be answerable to the bishop, who could deal with the case according to his discretion; and in saying this, we feel that just as circumstances now demand, that bishops should have greater facilities for dealing summarily with inefficient and scandalous incumbents. Were such a change as we have suggested possible, we imagine that a far wider discretionary power would be consequently accorded to every "ordinary." There are, of course, other objections to the proposal, but to what scheme are there not objections? On the whole, we maintain that such a state of affairs would conduce to greater cordiality amongst the clergy of the parish, combined with increased interest in their work, which would produce much better and more permanent results.

PHILIPPIANS II. 5-11.

A Paper by the Rev. Prebendary BASSETT, M.A., Vicar of Dulverton, Somerset.

A considerable amount of inquiry and interest has gathered round this passage of Holy Scripture in connection with certain statements and suggestions that have been put forth in *Lux Mundi* and other recent publications. The Church of old was called upon to investigate the deep mysteries of the person of Christ, such as His perfect Deity, His perfect Humanity, the union of both in His one Person without confusion of the substances, and the distinction between them without a division of the personality. Neither did the task of sounding the depths of Deity terminate with the investigation of these questions that concerned the essential properties of the Lord, and the relations between the two natures united in His Person; but the mental attributes and powers of the Lord Jesus Christ became matters also of controversy. Some maintained that the human will, if it existed, was absorbed into the divine, and, at all events, only one will remained; whereas the Church determined that, as the will was an integral factor in the constitution of man, and that the Word took upon Him our nature in its solidarity, He must have possessed the human will, but that this was always subject to, and influenced by, the divine will. Such was the decision of the Sixth General Council, held at Constantinople, A.D. 681. The question that has arisen of late appears to be an extension of these discussions, or perhaps a retrograde resuscitation of ancient doubts and disputes. We are now challenged to define the nature, the amount, the universality, or the limitations of the knowledge possessed by our Lord after His incarnation. St. Luke ii. 52, says that Jesus "was advancing in *wisdom*," which, strange to say, is of late almost always misquoted as *knowledge*, though *σοφία* and *γνῶσις* are quite distinct. The question, however, proposed for solution is, What was the knowledge of Christ in His incarnate state? Was it (1) a divine knowledge eclipsing the human knowledge? or (2) was it human knowledge absorbing, and so, practically, extinguishing the divine? or (3) were there two knowledges—the divine and the human, the former elevating, assisting, and influencing the latter? The first-named is, perhaps, the most popular opinion; the second finds favour with the modern school of rationalism. This degrades Deity to the level of humanity, and makes Christ, after the theory of the ancient Nestorians, grow into being a God, rather than born God of the Virgin Mary. The third is, doubtless, the true orthodox and Catholic creed that there are two knowledges—the divine and the human without intermixture, though combined in one Person. In this person God the Father revealed Himself to mankind. Hence, in all matters of revelation which He made to us concerning the Father, concerning Himself, His Spirit, the Scriptures, the past, the present, or the future, things seen and unseen—such revelation, in the very nature of things, was, and must, be perfectly and entirely true, infallible, and beyond the range and reach of contradiction. The text at the head of this paper has been seized upon by the extremists, who argue that when the Word became flesh He "emptied Himself." He put aside His divine knowledge altogether, and placed Himself in the

position of an ordinary man who must gather his stock of knowledge simply from the education and training that fell to his lot; and, therefore, we must not expect in Christ more than the current knowledge of His day and country. As this text has so important a bearing upon the question thus opened out to us, a close examination of its contents may be of some value to the Christian student.

The Greek of the Received Text is as follows, the readings adopted by the Revisers being inserted in brackets.

Τοῦτο γὰρ φρονείσθω (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε) ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα (Θεῷ), ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ· διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ (τὸ) ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα· ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός.

It will be observed that the Revised Text has only three alterations, namely, in the fifth verse, the omission of *γάρ*, and the change of *φρονείσθω* into *φρονεῖτε*; and in the ninth verse the insertion of the article *τὸ* before *ὄνομα*. But there are several modifications in the translation, which is also capable of additional improvements.

We give the reading of the Revised Version as it stands:—"Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient *even* unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted Him, and gave unto Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven and *things* on earth, and *things* under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Of the textual variations, only one is of any importance in relation to the doctrine of the Deity of our Lord,—the prefixing of the article to *ὄνομα*—*the* name instead of *a* name. This, if accepted, at once defines the name to be the Holy Tetragrammaton *Jehovah*. The article is found in this place in the Sinaitic, the Alexandrine, and the Codex Ephraemi MSS., and the Peshitio Syriac has the emphatic form, which is the equivalent. It is omitted in the Vatican MS. (though this is often quoted on the other side), in the Codex Clarom., and the later uncials, F, K, and L. Most critics elect the former reading, which is, doubtless, the best, though the further unfolding of the name is sufficient to certify the name that was intended, even if it is anarthrous. The translation of the passage is a different matter, and consequently the interpretation. It is needless to say that, on account of the interest and importance of the passage, it has been a centre of controversy both in ancient and modern days, and, as time goes on, and the spirit of inquiry extends more widely and deeply, there is no likelihood of abatement in this pursuit after knowledge. We shall consider the more important words and phrases in the order in which they stand. "Who being or subsisting," this refers immediately to "Christ Jesus"; the latter is the personal name, the former the official title of our Lord. It is of Him that the following description is given, embracing, as it does, His pre-incarnate, His incarnate, and His glorified divine-human condition. *Ὑπάρχων* signifies *subsisting*, that is, existing rightfully, naturally, previously, originally, and hence it is implied from all eternity. "In the form of God," *Ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*. The use of this word *μορφὴ* in the LXX. is of great interest. It represents in Job iv. 16, תמונה—*an image* or form of the apparition that appeared to Eliphaz. In Isaiah xliv. 13 it stands for תבנית, the figure of a man represented by an idol. In Dan. iv. 33 (A.V. verse 36) it is the translations of the Chaldee זיו, rendered here "brightness"—the natural condition of Nebuchadnezzar's appearance. It is also the translation of the same word in ch. v. 6, 9, 10, where the countenance of Belshazzar is described as in alarm; and in vii. 28, where Daniel's countenance is in sad and solemn meditation. In Greek writers Plato employs this word as defining the *specific character* of anything; and Aristotle more loosely as the *sum total of qualities* in anything, or a realization of a conception. Putting these features of previous usage together, it would appear that in this place the word is employed to represent the manifestation or objective exhibition of subjective and intrinsic qualities. That the pre-incarnate Word was God was the mystery that lay enshrined in the mind of Deity, but the *μορφὴ* was the proof given of that truth. If, therefore, not strictly synonymous with *οὐσία*, *essence*, it is the condition of that state, its *sine quâ non*, without which as its basis and background it could have no place; the *form* is not the form of a fiction, but the appreciative evidence of a reality. In this light, Heb. i. 3 supplies a remarkable parallel: *Ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*, "a ray put forth from the glory and the impression that represents his substance;" and John i. 18, "The only-begotten God (Son) who is in the bosom of the Father, He declared Him" (*Ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο*). Indeed, some theologians, both ancient and modern, are of opinion that in usage *μορφὴ* and *οὐσία* are identical; thus Gregory of Nyssa (*Contra Eunom.*) writes, *ἡ δὲ μορφὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ ταὐτὸν τῇ οὐσίᾳ πάντως ἐστίν.* "But the form of God is the same thing altogether as His essence."

We now come to the greatest difficulty of the passage *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, rendered in the Authorised Version. "He thought it not robbery to be equal with God." And in the Revised Version, "Counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God." There are three distinct and different explanations of this passage which may be set forth, in order for the sake of convenience.

(1.) The first, which is practically that of the Authorised Version, may be paraphrased thus:—"Let the same mind of humility characterise you as it did Christ Jesus; He was pre-existent in the form of God, and did not think His equality with the Father an act of robbery, usurpation, encroachment, assumption, or self-assertion; but though He was thus equal with God, He divested Himself of the *insignia* of Deity and assumed the form of servant by taking upon Him the likeness of men, and when He was found in outward mien and fashion as man, He humbled Himself even in that state, and became obedient unto death, and that death the lowest of all, the death by crucifixion; wherefore God highly exalted Him, and gave Him now as God-man the name which is above every name, that in His name and authority all beings in heaven and earth and

under the earth should do homage to Him, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, to the glory of God the Father." It will be noted in this interpretation that the words before us are understood to mean that His equality with God was an eternal fact, and that His right to this equality and all that it involved He did not consider as an act of assumption, or grasping, or self-appropriation on His part, but as an inalienable attribute which had subsisted from all eternity, as Christ Himself testified in John xvii. 5: "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."

(2.) The second is that of the R.V. which may thus be expanded: "Be ye of the same humble mind that Christ Jesus was, who, though he subsisted originally in the form of God, did not reckon his equality with God as a prize to be tenaciously retained or adhered to, but divested himself," etc., as above. In this exposition the emphasis, it will be remarked, is placed not on the assertion of His divine rights, but on His humiliation in surrendering them, and coming down to suffer here below; hence it will be seen that the noun ἁρπαγμὸς is not interpreted as an *act*, but as a *possession*—not a seizing, but the thing seized, as though it were ἅρπαγμα, and the whole phrase is expounded of His willingness to relinquish the treasure.

(3.) The third explanation is that of Arius and his followers, that Christ being an inferior god, did not seize upon equality with God, who was greater; He did not contemplate such an ἁρπαγμός. This in varieties of cautiously modified forms, which all tend to the conclusion that divine equality was not properly His, has found acceptance with certain modern critics, especially in Germany, some of whom insist that the name "Christ Jesus" can only refer to the Lord in His earthly career; and so they refuse to apply the passage to His pre-incarnate state. It may be added that besides these three distinct lines of interpretation, others have been proposed with a view of combining the two first mentioned systems of exposition.

The question naturally arises, whether we can gather any conclusive evidence out of the ancient versions, from the words they employed, how this expression was understood by those who are reputed as representative interpreters? The answer is but imperfect. The interchange between the subjective and objective use of words of this nature, and the rapidity with which in all languages they travel from the former to the latter, must always cast the same haze of uncertainty upon the translation as already envelopes the original. The Peshitto Syriac renders ἁρπαγμὸν by *chethuphyo*, which signifies the *act of grasping*, as may be seen by its being used as the translation of ἁρπαγῆς in Matt. xxvi. 25. The Latin versions have *rapinam*, which everyone knows, signifies first the *act of plundering*, but is commonly used for the *thing plundered*. The same doubt clings to the equivalents in the other versions, and it appears upon the same principle. All that can be said is that ἁρπαγμός properly signifies the *act* of grasping or seizing, and so also do its representatives, but, on the other hand, as it is possible that ἁρπαγμὸς may mean the object seized, so the same possibility accompanies the translations. The patristic exposition of the passage before us also varies. As the statement has two sides, the one asserting the Lord's intrinsic rights, and the other His voluntary surrender and divestiture, this double interpretation was to be expected, and each writer, naturally enough, appears to explain the passage in this way or that according as the argument he had in hand required. It is generally stated that the Greek Fathers favoured the view which is placed second in our list; but this does not appear to be without exception. Eusebius, for instance (*H. E.*, V. 2), has preserved to us a letter of the churches of Gaul, written in the latter half of the second century, which is usually claimed in support of this opinion, but this is more than doubtful. The passage runs thus (we give it in a translated form for the benefit of general readers): "They also became to so great an extent zealous followers and imitators of Christ, who 'subsisting in the form of God thought not equality with God ἁρπαγμὸν,' that being in such an honour, and not once or twice, but often, having acted the part of martyrs, and being again taken away from the wild beasts, and having brands and scars and wounds spread over them, did neither proclaim themselves martyrs, nor permit us to address them by this name; but if any of us ever by letter or by word addressed them as martyrs they rebuked us severely." The comparison is clear: Christ was in the form of God, and regarded His equality with God as an essential right; these disciples had really suffered for His sake, and had a right to be esteemed martyrs; but as Christ divested Himself of His rightful insignia, so they waived their claim to the name they were entitled to. It is true that the example of Christ's humility is reflected in them, but it is based upon the legal right that their master had to the name of *God*, and they to that of *martyr*.

Irenæus, in a passage preserved only in the Latin translation, hints at the same view: "Wherefore our Lord, heading up all things in Himself in the last times, came to us, not as He Himself could have come, but as we could see Him. For He Himself could have come to us in His own ineffable glory, but we could not have borne the greatness of His glory." (*Adv. Hær.*, IV. 74). Hippolytus maintains the assertion of the divine rights in Christ before enlarging on His humiliation and after exaltation: "Since the only Begotten Word of God, being God of God, has emptied Himself, according to the Scriptures, humbling Himself as a volunteer to that which He was not before, and took on Himself this inglorious flesh; afterwards He is said also to be highly exalted, and as if well nigh He had it not because of His Humanity; and, by the award of grace, He receives the name which is above every name, according to the word of the blessed Paul. But the matter, in truth, was not a giving, as for the first time, of what He had not by nature; far otherwise, but rather must be understood as a return and restoration to that which existed in Him in the beginning, essentially and inseparably." *Comm. in Gen.* Again, St. Athanasius writes: "The Son of God altogether; for this cause also He did not think the equality with God ἁρπαγμόν." (*Contra Arian.*) It may be that the bulk of Greek exposition is on the side of the second interpretation, but the few examples above given, will show that this is not universal. But when we come to the Latin Fathers they are almost without an exception on the side of the first interpretation.

Thus Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.*, v. 20) writes, "He says that He, being constituted in the image of God, did not think the being equal with God *rapinam*, but emptied Himself." Again (*Adv. Prax.* vii), "Is that Word of God a void and empty thing, which is called the Son, Who Himself is designated God. 'The Word was with God, and the Word was God.' It

is written, 'Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain,' this for certain is He, 'who being in the form of God thought not the being equal with God, *rapinam*.'" Novatian, the schismatic Bishop of Rome, as quoted by Tertullian, has also, "For although He remembered that He was God from God the Father, He never either compared or matched Himself with God the Father, remembering that He was from His Father, and that He had this very thing that He is, because the Father had given it. Hence, in fine, both before the assumption of the flesh, and moreover after the assumption of the body, yet further after even the resurrection He rendered, just as He renders all obedience in all things to the Father. From which it is proved, that He never thought His Divinity, that He should make Himself equal to God the Father *rapinam quandam*." St. Ambrose in his *De Fide* says, "For what a man has not, he endeavours to seize, therefore He did not consider equality with the Father *rapinam*." Augustine also (*Serm.* 183), "The Son did not think His being equal with God *rapinam;* it was not His by *rapina*, it was His by nature; thus He was from eternity, thus He was equal with the Father." Primasius, who in the sixth century commented on the Epistles of St. Paul, compiling chiefly from Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, etc,. says, "He did not seize what He had, that is, He did not seize equality with the Father, which he had by nature."

It will be seen by these selections that not a few of the Greek Fathers, and all the Latin ones, with perhaps one or two exceptions, understood ἁρπαγμὸς in its active sense, as an *act of seizing*. At the revival of learning at the period of the Reformation, nearly all the scholars and divines of that movement followed the same interpretation, such as Luther, Calvin, Beza, etc. Among Anglican divines may be noted such names as Pearson, Waterland, etc., but of the theologians of our day, the majority, both at home and abroad, seem more inclined to adopt the second mode of understanding this phrase; and there are not wanting some who even favour the third mode of interpretation, for which, however, it will be enough to say that it originated with the Arian party, and was refuted by Chrysostom and others in early days, and can find no countenance with any who have regard for the coherence of doctrinal definitions or the ordinary laws of exegetical propriety. This will be the most fitting place to examine the word under consideration more closely.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." October, 1890. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Mr. A. H. Hutton continues his criticisms of the late Cardinal Newman. It may of course be quite true that "in his relation with persons he (Cardinal Newman) showed a marked favouritism, such as is commonly and naturally the characteristic of celibates," and also that "any one disappointed or thwarted him, found him to an extraordinary degree implacable;" but somehow we do not feel that Mr. Hutton's opinion — judging from the tone of his papers—is decisive. The preference of one great mind for a kindred spirit no doubt seems "favouritism" in the eyes of some; and so also does a continuous conflict for what is believed to be a vital principle seem "implacability." If he mismanaged matters connected with buildings and the like, so have many more, who also should never have meddled with so much detail. Cardinal Newman has left his mark on the intellectual life of the age, and these trifles are simply beside the mark.

We like Dr. Cox's sermon on "Wisdom" exceedingly. We always meet Dr. Cox again with pleasure, especially when his old antagonist, "eternal punishment," is absent.

Dean Perowne has some notes on Genesis; they are very scholarly, and we shall be glad to have them continued.

Principal Brown has misnamed his paper, "In the Study of the Greek Testament." The Greek is not "studied" at all, and the style is chatty.

Dr. Milligan continues his very able papers on the "Resurrection," and Professor Findlay writes on "St. Paul at Thessalonica."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

Dear Sir,—Absence from home and other circumstances have prevented my replying as early as I would like to Messrs. Lawrence and Murphy. Their letters shall now, with your kind permission, receive due and respectful attention. I offer thanks and promise brevity.

Mr. Lawrence says that "the Catechism, as he understands it, teaches . . . . that there are only two (Sacraments) as generally necessary to salvation." He also thinks that marriage, etc., etc., are at least sacramental. Here are two strange statements. He is the first who would say that the Church of England teaches that there are more than two sacraments. "Two only" cannot mean more than two, save only to a quibbler. His second statement implies that anything and everything may be a sacrament. In a certain sense this is true. But what is the worth of such information?

I questioned the propriety of the Inspector's teaching because it was not scriptural. It implied that something was procured by baptism, which was further enhanced by Confirmation, irrespective of the mind and will and work of the recipient. I do not accept the *opus operatum* view which is so fashionable in many quarters in these days. Grace may come at Baptism, and Grace may come at Confirmation, and it may not. Hooker laid it down with respect to the Lord's Supper, "the Presence of the Saviour"—I am quoting from memory—"was not to be found in the bread or in the wine, but in the faith of the worthy recipient." From all this Mr. Lawrence may gather, as I think, the correct notion of the value of the Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Mr. Lawrence wishes me to be more distinct in expressing my views on the value of Confirmation. I have no objection to be this; but I was rather seeking to have the position justified or otherwise of those who talk so much of the Grace of Confirmation. I consider—though perhaps my opinion is not worth

much—Confirmation a most inestimable institution. It is a rite whose importance we cannot value too highly. I may say that I have every reason to say this, for it was the turning-point under God's blessing of my life. I felt that what I had promised I must perform. But this is the very reason why I would always say, Have a care! You may but harden yourselves in a course of sin.

I should be afraid to give a definition of Grace. But when people say that Grace is attached to Confirmation, and I see persons confirmed, living in sin, I think I have a right to ask, What do you mean by Grace?

I do not suggest — nor seem to — that Romish teaching on the questions of "faith and work" is most in accordance with reason. Faith is a higher principle than reason, as reason is higher than instinct. In the Romish system there is no room for faith in the proper sense of the word. Did Mr. Lawrence read my letter backwards?

Mr. Lawrence also thinks that Cardinal Newman was guided by faith rather than by reason. He would otherwise not have erred so grievously. Good. What then is reason? What then is faith? We had better have definitions. My conceptions of these principles of action are far other than those which Mr. Lawrence holds. Faith is the outgoing of the soul to its God when reason would scarcely lead to His footstool.

I cannot quite agree with Mr. Lawrence in his criticism of Newman's hymn. Here is my reason—Poetry is art; art is true to nature. In other words, poetry is the embodiment of truth in elevated thought and language. I have never yet been able to discover any truth in the hymn. If any other reader has been more successful, I should be glad to know his mind.

I am astonished at the contents of Mr. Murphy's letter. According to his interpretation of Scripture there are two means of salvation, faith and works. These two principles are as opposite as the poles. I suppose he knows all about the Lutheran controversy on St. James's teaching and its apparent conflict with St. Paul's? He should know, too, how the conflict has been settled. Otherwise, I should like to ask him how it is possible to reconcile the fact that God saves some by their works and others by their faith?

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, September 26, 1890.

THE S. BARTHOLOMEW MASSACRE IN 1572.

SIR,—On the eve of this anniversary, in a Dublin paper, appeared the astounding statement that equal, if not worse, massacres were perpetrated by French Protestants, ten years before, in six cities in the South of France. No authority is given except "the late Dr. Littledale." Hearing from London that his tract is out of print, I can only ask for the passages on which the statement is made. What is peculiar to the Paris massacre is that it took place in time of peace; that the Huguenots were treacherously brought to Paris, on the safe conduct of the King: that he not only witnessed the massacre, but shared in it, and triumphed over it; and lastly, that the Pope had a medal cast and pictures painted in honour of the event. Other massacres there have been, as of Glencoe, Drogheda, and the Irish in 1641. But none of these were battues, with the game treacherously collected for the purpose; in none did a king take part as plotter and executioner against his own subjects; none was blessed by the head of the religion of the murderers. The only thing at all like it is Nero's lighting his games with torches, these torches being Christians covered with pitch. This is the only parallel to the Paris massacre of 1572. De Thou, a Roman Catholic writer, tells us that 10,000 fell in Paris, besides 20,000 more throughout the kingdom. The paper which contains this slander on Huguenots is not a Romish paper, or a Radical, but a Protestant religious paper, which claims to be the organ of our clergy. Being excluded from its columns, I have to put my question through you. All I ask for is the authority for the statement.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Canon and V.-G. of Kildare.

ROMANISM.

SIR,—I beg to send you the enclosed with a request that you will publish it in your columns as a matter of interest to three classes of your readers, (*a.*) Controversialists, as evidence of what Rome of the nineteenth century really is; (*b.*) Those of our Communion who have "verted" or contemplate doing so, to let them know a little more about the "infallible church;" (*c.*) Those who have home reunion at heart, to show how difficult would be the task of uniting the Church of Bible truth with that which bears the name of the City on Seven Hills, I say nothing about the prayer as it speaks for itself.

W. S. RAINSFORD.

Crewe.

"PRAYER TO ST. JOSEPH.

"Ordered by His Holiness, Leo XIII., to be said as part of the Devotions for the month of October.

"To thee, O blessed Joseph, we have recourse in our tribulations, and while imploring the aid of thy most holy Spouse, we confidently invoke thy patronage also. By that love which united thee to the Immaculate Virgin Mother of God, and by the fatherly affection, with which thou didst embrace the Infant Jesus, we humbly beseech thee graciously to regard the inheritance which Jesus Christ purchased by His blood, and to help us in our necessities by thy powerful intercession.

"Protect, O most provident guardian of the Holy Family, the chosen children of Jesus Christ; ward off from us, O most loving Father, all taint of error and corruption; graciously assist us from Heaven, O most powerful Protector, in our struggle with the powers of darkness; and as thou didst once rescue the Child Jesus from imminent peril to His life, so now defend the Holy Church of God from the snares of her enemies and from all adversity. Shield each one of us with thy unceasing patronage, that imitating thy example, and supported by thy aid, we may be enabled to live a good life, die a holy death, and secure everlasting happiness in heaven. Amen.

"(300 days' Indulgence—applicable to the souls in Purgatory—once every day of the year for recital even in private.)

"(Indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines for each public recital during month of October.)

"*Imprimatur:* GULIELMUS,
"*Archiep. Dublin., Hib. Primus.*"

WITH respect to our notice of the installation at Gloucester Cathedral of the Rev. J. P. A. Bowers to the canonry, resuscitated through the munificence of the late Mr. John Walker, "C. W. W." reminds us that "Mr. Walker re-endowed the suspended canonry as a memorial of his friend, that good and true Churchman, the late Mr. Gambier-Parry, of Highnam Court."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Aitkens, Rev. Albert, B.A., Vicar of Stowupland, Suffolk.

Allin, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Onibury, Salop.

Banham, Rev. D. B. R., M.A., Rector of Bincombe-with-Broadway, Dorchester; Rector of Ashdon, near Saffron Walden.

Barrett, Rev. Herbert D., Organising Secretary of the Church Society for Waifs and Strays; Vicar of Hunstanton, Norfolk.

Birkbeck, Rev. Benjamin, Vicar of St. Augustine's, College-green, Bristol; Vicar of Magor and Redwick. Monmouthshire.

Burton, Rev. F. M., LL.D., Senior Curate of Newport; Rector of Cowden, Kent.

Butler, Rev. Charles, Ewart, M.A., Vicar of Nunkeeling with Bewholm, Hull.

Carolin, Rev. John Robert, Sinclair, M.A., Rector of Wivenhoe, Essex.

Cockram, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of Adstock, Bucks.

Cornish, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Redcliffe; Honorary Canon in Bristol Cathedral.

Edwards, Rev. Edward John, M.A., Rector of Essendon, Herts.

Eykyn, Rev. Pitt, Vicar of Magor and Redwick, Monmouthshire; Vicar of St. Augustine's, College-green, Bristol.

Fell, Rev. James, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

Fellowes, Rev. J. C., M.A., Curate of St. James's, Stockton; Vicar of St. James's, Stockton.

Goodwin, Rev. Henry, M.A., Chaplain to the Watford Union Workhouse.

Goodrick, Rev. A. T. S., M.A., Rector of Winterbourne, Gloucestershire.

Hudson, Rev. John Clare, M.A., Vicar of Thornton, near Horncastle; Secretary to the Lincoln Diocesan Board of Education.

Hutchinson, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of SS. Philip and James, Leckhampton; Honorary Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

Jones, Rev. George William, M.A., Vicar of Tattington (alias Tannington) with Brunditch, Suffolk.

Keble, Rev. George Clarke, M.A., Rector of Hinton-Parva, Wilts; Vicar of St. Catherine's, Gloucester.

Payne, Rev. Charles Leonard, Rector of Willingale Spain, Essex.

Prendergast, Rev. James FitzGerald, Licensed to Officiate in Christ Church Mission-rooms (Parish of Christ Church, Stratford).

Riley, Rev. Edward, M.A., Chaplain to the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers (London Brigade).

Sadgrove, Rev. Thomas, Licensed to Officiate in St. Matthias's Mission Church (Parish of St. Mary's, Plaistow).

Steed, Rev. Augustus James, M.A., Vicar of Tuttington, Norfolk.

Wasdale-Watson, Rev. Thomas William, Vicar of Bobbington, Stourbridge.

Winter, Rev. George Robert, M.A., Rector of Welbourne, Norfolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Callender, Rev. Henry Sealy, Curate-in-Charge of Weston, at Southfield, Weston, Bath, on the 27th ult., aged 53.

Carpenter, Rev. Philip, Vicar of the parish, at Codsall, on the 28th ult., aged 35.

Cave-Browne-Cave, Rev. Verney, at Norton Curliew, near Warwick, on the 30th ult., aged 57.

Day, Rev. Henry Josiah, Vicar of Cheshunt, and formerly Rector of Barnsley, on the 3rd inst., aged 57.

Field, Rev. Dudley Thos. Bousquet, B.A., Assistant Curate of Haslingden, Lancashire, on the 30th ult., aged 25.

Gascoyne, Rev. Richard, at 16, Circus Bath, on the 29th ult., aged 96.

Gray, Rev. Edmund, Rector, at West Rounton Rectory, on the 1st inst., aged 64.

Phillips, Rev. Samuel John, M.A., at Tilney All Saints' Vicarage, Lynn, on the 3rd inst., aged 63.

Taylor, Rev. Thomas, for thirty-eight years Rector of the parish, at Boscomb Rectory, Wilts, on the 30th ult., in his 91st year.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

OPPOSITIONS OF SCIENCE.

By the Rev. JOHN BROOKS PENFOLD.

Sermon Preached in St. James's Church, Marylebone, on Sunday, September 7th, 1890.

"Profane babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called."—1 Tim. vi. 20.

I HAVE used the old and somewhat inaccurate translation because it better suits the purpose of my remarks this morning. For many centuries the Bible has been interwoven into our English life, public and private, from the cradle to the grave. At a monarch's coronation the same words ring out which greeted the first Hebrew king, and over a peasant's grave roll the noble verses of a Hebrew Psalm. For better for worse the Bible is part and parcel of our religious life and sentiment, the fountain of authority, the text book of theology, and this truth is apprehended, not only by the friends of religion, but by its enemies.

Go where you will in London on a Sunday afternoon you will find every corner occupied by some orator, on platform, tub, or rail, and from his lips you will in some form or other gather this truth. Either his speech will be some string of texts and paraphrases from the Hebrew Scriptures, or else some violent and scurrilous invective against those Hebrew Scriptures. In either case you will find recognised the cardinal fact that the religious and historical literature of the Jews thoroughly permeates the religious thought of nineteenth century Christianity.

It is on this account that all the efforts of scepticism and agnosticism are levelled particularly and venomously against these Hebrew Scriptures. For many years the general aim of the "babblings," profane or otherwise, and also of the "opposition of science falsely so called," have been to throw discredit upon the writings which are felt to be the very head and front of all religious offending, from the sceptical point of view. This is always the main theme of the tubman, whatever be his position socially and intellectually, and it is with the original representative of all the tubmen that I want to deal this morning.

Professor Huxley has one of these tubs in his possession, and almost every year about this time he gets it out, generally in the *Nineteenth Century Review*, and demonstrates, to his own satisfaction, that religion generally is a myth and Christianity in particular a humbug. Let me say, *en passant*, that I wish to speak with respect and admiration of Professor Huxley, no man is of nobler character, no one has sacrificed more to the cause of truth. But it is because he is sometimes apt to seek truth in wrong directions—perhaps because having discovered some truths, he occasionally thinks he has a monopoly of all truth—that I am speaking of him in this place.

Many of you have doubtless read Professor Huxley's article in the *Nineteenth Century* of July, and you will have perceived that his demolition of Christianity rests upon one proposition. That any inaccuracy in the Hebrew Scriptures is fatal to Christian theology. That proposition he ingeniously adopts from certain eminent orthodox divines. And, having got it, without inquiring too curiously into its soundness, he proceeds to his end remorselessly. Now let me say, once and for all, that if that proposition can be maintained, Professor Huxley is right. If any proven instance of inaccuracy in the Hebrew Scriptures is fatal to Christian theology, then we must shut up our churches and burn our sermons. There is no escape for us, if our religion is not to have a scientific and logical basis, as well have none at all.

But it is just here that we find the fallacy, no matter whence originated or by whom encouraged, it may be the utterance of an agnostic professor, it may be the *brutum fulmen* of some old-fashioned eloquent divine. Is it the case that any proven inaccuracy in the Hebrew Scriptures is fatal to all Christian theology?

It is said, and *si non e vero e ben trovato*, of an older and more eminent philosopher than Professor Huxley, that when he was lecturing to a class of students on the impossibility of motion, and waxed rather dull, as even great men can, from Homer downwards, his students got up and left the class-room and the professor lecturing to empty benches. And from that episode in the life of the stoic Zeno arose the proverb, "*Solvitur ambulando*," which means that the question is settled by a practical test

Now apply that test to the proposition of Professor Huxley. Grant for the moment that the Old Testament is a mere theological romance, that the authors of the Jewish Scriptures were very artful impostors, and that our forefathers for many generations were the victims of a delusion and a snare. How does that affect Christian theology? How does that impugn the authorship and genuineness of the Synoptic Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul? The veriest tyro among critics will pause ere he replies, "Much any or every way." In your Prayer Book you will find a statement of Christian beliefs called the Apostles' Creed, not that the Apostles ever heard of it, but because it is supposed to contain the gist of Apostolic doctrine, and that is the summary of the belief

held by every professing Christian; it may even be more, but it is that at all events. Now let us go through that creed, sentence by sentence, clause by clause, and see whether a single word of it is affected by the historical character of the narrative of the deluge, by the doings of Joshua in Canaan, by the nature of the relations between Saul and David, by the precise application of the utterances of Jeremiah, or in fact by any passage of the Old Testament whatsoever. *Solvitur ambulando.* The logical truth is this, that if for any reason we were compelled to discard the whole of the Old Testament writings, we might have to make some (much needed) alterations in our theological manuals, we might have to make some modifications in the way we choose our texts, but the religious position of all those who seriously profess and call themselves Christians would remain unchanged.

"No," cries the tubman, "you are too fast; sink the Old Testament and the New Testament goes by the board. If the Old Testament is a tissue of falsehoods away with the Christ who appealed to it and the Apostles who adopted and adapted it." But it is the tubman who is too fast. Whatever be the truth about the Old Testament Scriptures this one thing is certain, that the whole Jewish nation in the time of Tiberius Cæsar believed in them. Mistaken or not, no Jew accepted any law but that of Moses, any religion but that of the sacrifices of Jehovah; any royalty but that which came down from David, any prophecy but that which was akin to the sayings of Isaiah and Jeremiah. He may have been deceived, though any nineteenth century Christian who has ever "gone to the Jews" will hardly think that likely; but anyhow that was his condition. Belief in the Hebrew Scriptures was an accomplished fact, and for our Lord and His Apostles to have approached the Jews by any other channel than the Law and the Prophets would have been impossible without some miraculous transformation of the whole religious and intellectual position of the nation. Therefore the whole question of the alleged divine sanction comes to the ground, unless we are to imagine that Christian teaching is wholly different in manner to any other teaching, and that our Lord was talking nonsense when He said, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." And now, having got so far, let me admit that both testaments are interwoven, and that the one without the other is incomplete, but that the two together are a magnificent and harmonious statement of the rise and progress of religious truth. This is a fact, but not a logical sequence. It is recognised by the Christian, but not demanded by the apologist. That is the point to dwell upon. While we admit the homogeneity of the Old and New Testaments, we are not going to maintain an actual parallel between every passage in both records, nor are we going to put upon the same footing the story of the Crucifixion and the story of Noah's Ark, or the story of the Last Supper and the story of Noah and the Vine. "All flesh is not the same flesh," and all the Bible is not the same Bible, nor, let me add, is any particular chapter of the Bible the whole Bible. And now, having disposed of the tubman's starting-point, let me briefly glance at his method, as exemplified in Professor Huxley's article. One particular narrative is taken, generally, as in this case, the Deluge; it is shown, with more or less success, to be unscientific, and historically inaccurate, and on that account *cadit quæstio*, the whole theological position, along with the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures, comes to the ground.

Now is that logical? Remember that I am making no demands on faith—that I am dispensing altogether with authority. Is it a fact that if one or more episodes in the Hebrew Scriptures are proved to be erroneous, the whole literature becomes valueless? I will ask for no more, and I will certainly ask for no less, than is accorded to the historical records of any ancient nation. Would any one maintain that, because the speeches which Thucydides puts into the mouths of Alcibiades and Nicias, are not their speeches, but his, and, in short, absolutely unauthentic, therefore the Athenian expedition to Syracuse 415 B.C. never took place, and that, in point of fact, the whole of the work of Thucydides is untrustworthy and a mere romance? Or if that illustration be too abstruse, I will suggest another. Because you cannot always rely on the genuineness of palæolithic remains, because unscrupulous agents round the corner have vamped up alleged arrowheads and fraudulent stone axes; nay, more, because even scientific experts have been deceived and mistaken in this matter, are there on that account no palæolithic remnants, and is the Old Stone Age an illusory romance of some fertile-brained geologist? Because some fancied monument has been found to bear no more interesting inscription than "Bill Stubbs, his mark," are we no more to believe in the brick-books of Nineveh? Because some fondly cherished Druidical monument is found only to be a rubbing-stone for cattle, shall we overthrow Stonehenge? No, my friends, the tubman's method is as mistaken as his premisses. Believe me, when we meet with the oppositions of science, as well as the profane babblings, the proper way is to answer the fool according to his folly, and to say boldly, "Yes, you are quite right, but show us where the application lies." Contradict the tubman when he makes havoc with the Deluge, and throws doubt upon the morality of David's relations with Bathsheba, and he is in his element. But give him all his points, and ask him to prove logically how all this interferes with the cardinal verities of the Christian Creed, and he is dumb.

So much, this morning, for our friend the tubman. Now for five minutes let me inquire into

the reasons, not only of the profane babblings, but of the oppositions of science, and what do I find?

I find science warring against religion, and religion against science, not, it is true, so much to-day as in past times, but the strife is still going on. Thank God I see signs already of a good time coming, when religion and science shall work hand in hand for the advancement of civilization and the amelioration of the race. But not yet. Meantime the first reason I see for this opposition of science is a feeling of revenge—half-unconscious perhaps, but still an obvious spring of action. And with reason. Time was when men of science all found themselves under the church's ban, and when the road to the discovery of scientific truth was blocked by the *ipse dixit* of the theologian, the church, seeking truth by the wrong channels, had committed itself to false positions and exploded systems, and, in defence of its own infallibility, was a persecutor of the real seekers after truth. That time has passed, but it has left its mark upon the relations between theology and science

And the next reason is, at bottom, mere human vanity. The man of science knows no obstacles. He tells the number of the stars. Yes, and moreover he knows their weights, and their component parts. Knowing no limitations of time or space, having achieved magnificent victories and an apparently boundless empire, he can conceive nothing beyond the range of his experiments. Accustomed to consider only actual phenomena, he is dubious or sceptical as to anything beyond or outside the limit of his senses. "I have swept the heavens," cried Lalande, "with my telescope, and have found no God." He might as well have used a broom-stick. The Most Mighty dwelleth not in temples made with hands and he certainly is not to be found with telescopes, or weighed with scales, and therefore the man of science cannot find him. It is now as in the days of Nero. "Some have not the knowledge of God."

But there is a subtler cause than this. The scientific sceptic is bound sometimes to feel how unsatisfactory his position really is. That he has changed it of late years, has profited him little or nothing. Whereas he was once a sceptic, now he is generally an agnostic—a word invented, I believe, by the very man whose opinions we are now discussing. But how hollow a name! How unsatisfactory a position! Consider; the man who was wont to answer, "I know" to every question he is asked, now says, "I don't know, I cannot tell." Here, in the one point which makes or mars all hope of happiness, his science fails him, and he is as helpless as a child. The lisping infant, the humble peasant, are better off than he. The loving trust, the confidence, the sublime hope which come of conviction and belief, are not for him. How galling must this be to any man, how humiliating to any intellectual man! Therefore the agnostic ever strives after self-conviction. Therefore he is ever labouring to disprove the position which, as it were, holds up the mirror to him, to show him what he is. This prompts as well the frothy vulgar eloquence of the illiterate tubman as the restless literary activity of a Huxley. Believe me, when the hour of reflection comes, then we go back to the words we heard in purer, happier, less troubled times. Above the doubting trouble of the senses, the soul catches the promise, "Thou shalt keep him in perfect peace," not the man who has won what the world gives and takes away, not the man whose utterances are weighed with reverence by the people of two hemispheres, not the man who hangs his head and replies, "I cannot tell," to the question, "Rehearse the articles of thy belief," but the man who has looked above and beyond material phenomena, and has found the perfect peace of self-conviction, and of loving trust—"Thou shalt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee."

REVOLUTION.

By the Rev. M. B. HOGG, B.A., Rector of Keady, Co. Armagh.

Sermon Preached in Keady Parish Church, on Sunday, August 10th, 1890.

"Jeroboam."—1 Kings xi. 26.

SPECIAL interest attaches to Jeroboam as being the first monarch of the newly formed kingdom of Israel. In this instance it would seem that revolution was expressly sanctioned by God, for although in the Divine message conveyed by Ahijah the Shilonite to the young warrior, the precise mode of operation was not clearly specified, it is evident that the revolt of the Ten Tribes, and the establishment of a hostile and independent kingdom in Israel, were events distinctly designed by an offended and jealous God. It is, moreover, somewhat remarkable that the principle of legitimate revolution is not condemned in Holy Scripture. Where a monarch betrays his trust, or proves a traitor to the King of kings, or misapprehends the true function of the leader of a nation's destinies, God always stirs up an adversary against him. Thus not only Jeroboam rebelled against Solomon, but also Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the son of Eliadah. In the days of Jehoram, when gross idolatry and noxious superstition were introduced by the "fair and subtle daughter of Ethbaal," Jehu the son of Jehosaphat, the son of Nimshi, effected successfully an authorised revolt against the unworthy monarch, and because he executed faithfully all the Divine behests, was granted a promise that his children to the fourth generation should occupy the throne of Israel. It is evident that this principle has received due recognition in England, because incapable kings have generally been

deposed, and since the establishment of Protestantism and the diffusion of spiritual light and knowledge throughout the land, Monarchs and Princes favourable to Romanism have usually been deprived of their royal rights and privileges. Thus Charles I., justly suspected of Romanizing tendencies, but, as it seems to me, unjustly convicted of abusing his royal prerogative, forfeited his crown, and was hounded to death by an infuriated and savage populace. And in the days of King James II., the right of the people to determine who should exercise the functions of supreme ruler of the kingdom was nobly vindicated in the banishment of that monarch and the investment of William of Orange with the kingly dignity. But it is at the same time evident that all revolution must, if the Scriptural example is to be followed, be conducted on legitimate and constitutional principles. If the functions of monarchy be imperfectly and inadequately discharged by a particular sovereign, no warrant is thereby offered for the conversion of the monarchical form of government into a republic or a commonwealth. Thus, if any future King of England became an Atheist or a Romanist he would obviously forfeit his right to the crown, and his subjects would be justified in denying him allegiance, and in yielding immediate homage to his legitimate successor of the Protestant faith; but no justification of the creation of a republic, or the establishment of an autocracy or oligarchy, would be *ipso facto* involved. In this sense *le roi est mort, vive le roi!* is an eternal and continuous principle. But kings and potentates occupy such a delicate and responsible and, at the same time, perilous position, that it behoves them to scrupulously guard their conduct, whether public or private, and to seek to cultivate the affection, and to win the respect and confidence of their subjects. In these days most people look for a *quid pro quo* in return for anything they render. And if homage and loyalty be bestowed, and taxes and revenues be contributed, and large sums of money voted ungrudgingly for the fitting maintenance of the kingly dignity, it is not an extravagant demand that in return for such adequate and loyal tribute the recipients should exhibit a practical interest in their people, and assiduously labour to promote by example and by action the spiritual, moral, and temporal prosperity of the nation. In these days, education of some sort is enjoyed by almost everybody. Capacity for a business, aptitude for an intelligent share in various works of practical utility is recognised and rewarded. Cultivated and hardheaded, practical, educated men will not be disposed to contemplate with equanimity the existence of a monarchy, the *personnel* of which may be inferior in intellectual strength or moral endowments. The subsequent history of Jeroboam is singularly instructive. There is a crisis happening once, or perhaps twice in most men's lives, which, if recognised, will lead to great things. Clive was not slow to perceive his opportunity when in India—by attacking Arcot and drawing off his forces from Trichinopoly. He succeeded in extricating himself from a dilemma, and in effecting the defeat of the French. But such a *coup d'état* could only occur once in a life time. Jeroboam had such a chance presented to him as few men possess, and on the first opportunity afforded him of recognising it he stumbled fatally and disastrously. Probably one eminent reason which may be assigned for the failure of Jeroboam was his sojourn in Egypt. Here he undoubtedly acquired a distrust in God, and learned those infidel principles which were afterwards so disastrously put into practice in Israel. The polished scepticism, the subtle sensuous splendour of the court of Pharaoh, sapped the solid foundations on which the faith of the brave young Jew was built, and he returned to his native land an idolater, a polytheist. The worship in which his widowed mother delighted was too simple; moreover, it involved the exercise of more credulousness than he was willing to maintain, and therefore he organised a new departure in Israel. He went on the down grade. Two rival deities were established. "These be thy Gods, O Israel." To-day belief in a whole and undivided Christ is termed credulity. Faith and obedience are merely "superstition." Zeal for God, loyalty to the Divinity of His Eternal Son is "fanaticism, madness." "I am not mad, most noble Festus—but speak forth the words of truth and soberness." Men make a huge blunder who reject the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus, and deny the absolute claim of Christ on their faith and obedience. They will not believe, because they cannot see. You are not asked to assign reasons for your acceptance of this truth. Possibly you may be vain enough to do so, but when God designed to save the world, by freely yielding up His Son, He did not take you into His confidence; He did not rely on human assistance. Men can add nothing to, and, despite human subtlety and reasoning, they have hitherto been unable to diminish the perfectness and completeness of the work of Jesus. Be not ashamed then of this service, your faith may be superstition, but they who prate of "conduct" as religion and denounce orthodox Christianity as a "fraud," are strangers to its power. *We* have meat to eat that *they* know not of. Our hopes may be built upon "chimeras," and based on "credulity," but to us they are no empty dreams, but living and permanent and eternal realities, the acceptance of and conforming to which alone will "bring a man peace at the last."

A SPECIAL service in connection with the Church Missionary Society was held on the 8th inst., at St. Bride's, Fleet-street, when Canon Girdlestone delivered a valedictory address to about seventy missionaries who are about to leave England for various places abroad. He took as his text Is. lx.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1890.

THE BEHRING'S SEA DISPUTE.

AMERICAN Christians and friends of Peace have now an excellent opportunity of very usefully organising combined efforts to induce their Government and their own people to adopt a just and conciliatory policy, for the settlement of the dispute which has arisen between their country and Great Britain, on the question of the Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries. It is not only a favourable opportunity, but a positive duty of our American brethren to promote the interests of peace and of the two great nations in this matter, and at this time; for the British Government has made a formal offer to that of the United States to submit the difficulty to Arbitration, inasmuch as the latter Government appears unwilling to accept those friendly arrangements, for a mutual settlement of the difficulty, which Lord Salisbury had suggested.

The source of the dispute is a simple one. It arises out of the claim of the Americans to the entire control and possession of the seal fisheries in the Behring's Sea and that part of the ocean off the territory of Alaska, a region which was purchased from Russia by the United States in 1867. It is now claimed by America that that purchase carried with it the acquirement of a sole right to the fisheries in the Behring's Sea. But Great Britain, and also Canada, very reasonably urge that Russia had no such right, or exclusive privilege, to sell. She never possessed it. It was never admitted by any other nation. The claim, if made by Russia, was distinctly denied by American Statesmen themselves, in the years before the recent pretensions were put forth by American sealers. Thus, in 1821, when Russia ventured to raise certain claims in this direction, the illustrious John Quincy Adams officially replied, through the American Ambassador at St. Petersburg — "The United States can admit no part of these claims; their right of navigation and of fishing is perfect, and has been in constant exercise from the earliest times, after the peace of 1783, throughout the whole extent of the Southern Ocean, subject only to the ordinary exceptions and exclusions of the territorial jurisdictions, which, so far as Russian rights are concerned, are confined to certain islands north of the 55th degree of latitude, and have no existence on the Continent of America."

Still more to the point, and much more recent, was the statement of Mr. Secretary Boutwell, in 1872, when Collector Phelps reported the fitting out of expeditions in Australia and Victoria for the purpose of taking seals in Behring's Sea, while passing to and from their rookeries on St. Paul and St. George Islands, and recommended that a steam cutter should be sent to the region of Ounimak Pass and the Islands of St. Paul and St. George. Mr. Secretary Boutwell informed him, in reply, that he did not consider it expedient to send a cutter to interfere with the operations of foreigners, and stated:—"In addition, I do not see that the United States would have the jurisdiction or power to drive off parties going up there for that purpose, unless they made such attempt *within a marine league of the shore.*" This is the precise point at issue. The Americans now claim to override the ordinary custom and virtual law of nations—viz., that all fisheries are free to all comers outside a limit of three miles, or one league, from the shores of seas and oceans.

This rule is so universally admitted, that it is to be wondered at that even Americans should venture to urge any plea to the contrary. But Mr. Secretary Blaine has not shrunk from thus threatening, on so unreasonable a pretext, the harmony and the peace which have happily characterised the mutual intercourse between the United States and Great Britain, of late years. President Harrison is a good man, in his capacity of a private citizen, but as a President he appears to be weak and to allow Mr. Blaine to assume the leading functions of the Government in various important departments. Mr. Blaine is an acute and able man, but he is apt to be erratic, and he pays great deference to Anti-British politicians in America. Even many of his own fellow-countrymen and their journals recognise his unstatesmanlike procedure in certain directions. Thus, for example, the *Boston Herald* and the *Philadelphia Telegraph* have very recently pictured him as an easily dissatisfied man, and as an extreme partisan rather than an administrator of judicial weight and wisdom. On several occasions, previously to the present, he has assumed an attitude towards Great Britain in particular, calculated to

excite uneasiness, if not positive alarm, and in marked contrast to the admirable friendliness and conciliatory diplomacy habitually manifested by those grand American Presidents, Lincoln, Garfield, and Grant.

It is further contended by the Americans, that British and Canadian fishermen, and especially the latter, have effected a wholesale destruction of the seals in Behring's Sea. The Canadians, on their part, deny this, and they have manifested a special determination to resist the American claims and to demand from the Home Government vigorous action for their protection in the matter. Thus the dispute is a sort of "triangular" one, and is therefore somewhat complicated as it now stands. Hence, and also on account of the natural relationship of the two great nations concerned, it is most desirable that this dispute should be speedily submitted to Arbitration. The British Government have taken the initiative in proposing this step for acceptance by the United States. Lord Salisbury has instructed the English Ambassador at Washington to make the following definite proposals to the American Government:—

"1. That the two Governments agree forthwith to refer to Arbitration the question of the legality of the action of the United States' Government in seizing or otherwise interfering with British vessels engaged in the Behring's Sea, outside of territorial waters during the years 1886, 1887, and 1889.

"2. That pending the award, all interference with British sealing vessels shall absolutely cease.

"3. That the United States' Government, if the award should be adverse to them on the question of legal right, will compensate British subjects for losses which they may sustain by reason of their compliance with the British Proclamation. Such are the three conditions on which it is indispensable, in the view of Her Majesty's Government, that the issue of the proposed proclamation should be based."

Can any offer be fairer or more straightforward than this? We hope, therefore, that intelligent Americans, and especially their Churches, may institute prompt and effectual endeavours to elicit throughout their great country, and in the columns of the Press, a clear and emphatic expression of a determination not to allow the peaceful relations between the two kindred peoples to be strained, much less broken; and, in order that such a result may be obviated, that they may insist upon the acceptance by their own Statesmen, at Washington, of the friendly and reasonable proposal made by the British Government.

IT is announced that Canon Body is going to South Africa to conduct a series of Missions.

CANON CAPEL CURE is expected to leave England shortly for Egypt, where he proposes to reside during the winter season for the benefit of his health.

PHILIPPIANS II. 5-11

A PAPER BY THE REV. PREBENDARY BASSETT, M.A., VICAR OF DULVERTON, SOMERSET.

(*Continued from page* 178.)

GREEK nouns in μος are properly active in sense; hence, strictly speaking, ἁρπαγμὸς must signify the *act of seizing*, or grasping, not the *thing seized;* this would be expressed by ἅρπαγμα. Further, the idea contained in the word is not that of depriving another of a possession, but rather that of gaining something for oneself. Moreover, this particular word ἁρπαγμὸς is exceedingly rare; not only is it unknown to the LXX., but it is only once met with in profane literature, but in this solitary place (Plutarch, *De Puer. Educ.*) it is used in its proper active meaning: Καὶ τοὺς μὲν Θήβησι καὶ τοὺς Ἠλιδι φευκτέον ἔρωτας καὶ τὸν ἐκ Κρήτης καλούμενον ἁρπαγμόν. The instances in which the word occurs in patristic writers are either quotations of or references to this passage, and hence the sense imposed upon the word only reflects the private interpretation of this passage as held by each commentator. As we have seen, it is pleaded that ἁρπαγμὸς must be used here for ἅρπαγμα, on the ground that nouns in μος are found lapsing from their active sense into a passive one, and that the phrases ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι and ποιεῖσθαι are not unfrequently found in Greek authors: but a great and real difficulty meets us here, which we must strongly emphasize, notwithstanding the illustrious names which endorse the passive meaning. The noun ἅρπαγμα is a well-known word; its use in the LXX. is frequent (see Lev. vi. 4; Ps. lxi. 11; Isaiah lxi. 8; Ezek. xviii. 7, 12, 16, xix. 3, 6, and xxii. 25, 27); whereas, as we have just noted, ἁρπαγμὸς does not occur at all. Now, why did St. Paul use this almost unknown word? If the passive sense had been the one he wanted to express, the word was ready for his use. He must have had strong reasons for going out of his way to discard the well-known and familiar word and to adopt an exceedingly rare, we might almost say, an unknown word. There is but one sensible reply to this question—the only reason that can be assigned for his doing so is that he wanted to express the idea which was couched in the *active* form, and to avoid that which was in the *passive* one. The only real meaning, therefore, which the word can have is an *act of seizing, or of usurpation.* There is an interesting article on this passage by Professor Beet in the *Expositor*, vol. v. 115, Third Series, in which the writer follows in the main the exposition of Meyer and Cremer in giving to ἁρπαγμὸς its proper active sense; but after this he weakens the whole argument by making the word signify the *means of grasping.* This is rather wide of the exact force of the word, because nouns in μος, as we have said already, imply the act itself, and not the means or occasion of achieving it. Τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ—*the being equal with God.* τὸ εἶναι here states a fact which had real existence; ἴσα, the neuter plural, which is advisedly employed instead of the masculine singular, is used adverbially, so far as grammar is concerned, to express *as*, like as, equally; but theologically it points to the essence, nature, and attributes as being alike and equal, whilst it tacitly suggests a distinction of person. Ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, *He made Himself of no reputation.* This is a very free translation; literally, it is *He emptied Himself*, but this is far from being a suit-

able or satisfactory rendering. It is with this word, as a point of departure, that we pass from the pre-incarnate state to the incarnate state of the Word; the first portion of the paragraph finds its echo in "though He was rich," and the second, on which we here enter, in the "for your sakes He became poor" (2 Cor. vii. 19).

A large amount of the present controversy concerning the limitation of Christ's human knowledge has been made to rest upon this phrase. It has been assumed that the word, when He became flesh, so laid aside all the properties of Deity, and that He lived so truly a human life, that that life was quite uninfluenced by the fact that He took upon Himself our nature, and not that our nature took Him; further, that the precincts of this knowledge were bounded by the circle of His Jewish education and the experiences to be found in a Galilæan village. Hence it is inferred that we are not to expect scientific knowledge, critical or historical accuracy in His teaching—indeed nothing more than an example of perfect piety and moral beauty. If a proof is demanded for this low humanitarian view, which borders closely upon Nestorianism, the reply is ready, "He emptied Himself." Some people are satisfied, and close all further investigation and argument the moment that a text is quoted. It never seems to occur to some minds to ask such a question as "emptied Himself" of what? Is it of the Divine essence, or the Divine powers, or the Divine knowledge, or of what? The passage before us is perfect in its enunciations, hence a satisfactory reply awaits the question. What does it say that Christ originally had? *He subsisted in the form*, μορφῇ, *of God.* What was it He assumed? *The form*, μορφὴ, *of servant by becoming in the likeness of man.* What was it then of which Christ divested Himself? It was the *form* of God. Now, we have seen that μορφὴ is the *recognizable* side of the essence or intrinsic reality, it must, therefore, be the (to us) visible tokens of this state that the Lord divested Himself of; the indwelling essence of Deity. He could not lay aside, as this was His own very self, the core and centre of His Being. Such an interpretation as severing Himself, though only for a time, from this, would negative the whole testimony of Scripture on this doctrine and nullify the Incarnation. Neither could it be the Divine attributes or operations, as these are the necessary results of His being Divine, neither could it affect the Divine knowledge, as Deity without omniscience would be no longer Deity, and without Divine knowledge how could He be a teacher sent from God, how could He reveal the Father, and be the Light of the World? Hence the stripping or emptying of Himself must be of that which concerns the *form*, the visible and recognizable tokens of Deity. During the days of His humiliation, He unrobed Himself of the *insignia* of the Godhead, such as the *glory* which He had with the Father before the foundation of the world, the *Shekinah* that attended Him on all the embassies which He, as the Angel of Jehovah, discharged for the Father, the *light* that illumined the Pillar and enveloped the Bush, and the unapproachable brilliancy which dazzled the eyes of the Seers. Of these and such like manifestations, the outcome of Divine royalty, the equipments of the Deity that pronounced Him Divine, and if exhibited would have compelled submission and belief, He bared Himself, and assumed the disguise of humanity, the earth-clothes of flesh and blood. The "truly human life" on some lips seems to mean a truly human life, *minus* the Divine life; the faithful, on the other hand, believe in the "truly human life" *plus* the Divine Life. Μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, *taking the form of servant.* The participle λαβὼν is here to be taken gerundally, *by taking*, showing the way how He humbled Himself. As in His pre-incarnate state He was manifested and known in the μορφὴ, the *form* of God, so now He was manifested and known in the *form* of man; the former state was the exponent of a reality, as He was truly God and recognised as such, so now he was truly man, and recognised as such, but He did not cease to be the former by becoming the latter; the Incarnation was a union of both natures, not the change of one into the other, or the loss of the divine to gain the human, but as Primasius well says, "by taking upon Himself what He was not, not by losing what He was." But what are we to understand by "servant" in this place? Most commentators explain, not the servant of men but of God. It seems, however, to have escaped observation that the reference is here made to the prophecies of the latter portion of Isaiah, in which "the servant of Jehovah" bears so conspicuous a part. This title was only applied to eminent agents of the Most High, who either inaugurated a new dispensation, or revived a former one that had fallen into disuse or oblivion. It was, therefore, pre-eminently a designation of the Messiah, who was to head up in Himself all that had gone before, and become the author of a new covenant, which was based upon the foundation of the old, and yet is the new dispensation of grace and life.

Ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, *having become in the likeness of men.* Here again the participle γενόμενος, which is a further expansion of the preceding subject is to be taken gerundally—*by becoming in the likeness of men.* He was not this originally and eternally, but became so in time. The Incarnation is frequently defined by this word, thus, "The word became (ἐγένετο) flesh" (John i. 14); "which became (τοῦ γενομένου) of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3).

The ὁμοίωμα, *likeness*, is no spectral likeness or apparition, as some of the Gnostics taught, but the similitude, the like nature, conformation and perfection of manhood, the word being chosen at the same time to show that, though He was man, He was something more, there was that which differentiated Him from all others, though He was partaker of our flesh and blood.

This closes the first stage in the declining path of humiliation; we now enter upon a deepening of the depth. He had humbled Himself from heaven to earth, and had changed the robes of glory for the sackcloth of dust and ashes; but now we are called to see Him descending to the lowest depth that humanity can reach.

Καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν, *and being found in fashion as man, He humbled Himself. Being found* is a frequent Hebrew phrase, which is equivalent to *being visibly.* Σχῆμα, *fashion*, is an interesting word, especially as it seems to stand here in contradistinction to μορφὴ, *form.* Σχῆμα, *fashion, style*, etc., signifies the outward appearance, dress or semblance, which a person may assume and alter; thus, whereas μορφὴ, *form* is not subject to change, inasmuch as it is inseparable from the attributes of its possessor, σχῆμα is variable. A comparison of the passages in which μορφὴ and its cognates, and σχῆμα

and its cognates are found, will show this distinction; hence, as we have seen, the *form* of God or the *form* of servant, defines the true state and condition as such; and *fashion* the outward mien and appearance He presented to those with whom He lived and conversed.

Ὡς ἄνθρωπος, *as man*; ὡς is here the particle of realisation, not of comparison. The rendering of A. V. and R. V. "as *a* man" does not seem sufficiently exact. Why is the indefinite article inserted? It is a common fault in both versions to supply the indefinite article when there is no article expressed in Greek; but as Greek has no indefinite article, and the English has, the two languages are not in an even balance. The omission of the article altogether in English is often the best translation. Such is the case here. It is not the individuality that is insisted on (which in our Lord was divine), but the humanity. *As man* would have expressed this more correctly.

Such being His position, *He humbled Himself.* When subsisting solely in the Divine nature, He condescended to assume the human, and having assumed, He humbled Himself to the deepest degradation and suffering that humanity is capable of, *by becoming* (γενόμενος) *obedient*—even unto death, and that death the death of the Cross. In this death, at once the most infamous and intolerable, the Lord attained the extremest limit of possible endurance, and bowed Himself to the lowest degree of self-surrender and shame.

We have now witnessed the last goal of humiliation. At this point the ladder, whose foot rests in the grave and whose summit leans against the throne of heaven, is set up, and the Saviour, having accomplished the work which the Father gave Him to do, scales the upward path. But in the commencement of the descent and the commencement of the ascent there is a great difference to be observed. On starting on the former mission the Word was God alone, but on returning He is man as well as God—Immanuel—Θεάνθρωπος, God-man. The glorification, henceforth His prerogative, is not only the resuming the Divine *insignia* which He had laid aside, but by taking the manhood into God, Deity and humanity, as united in Him, were to be associated for ever in the honours of Eternity. The Word became flesh, and the flesh having suffered and triumphed in union with the Word, is to be glorified together. *Wherefore*, because of His humiliation to death, *God highly exalted Him and gave Him the name which is above every name*, that is, the highest title of Deity, *Jehovah.* Here we perceive the reason of the choice of the verb ἐχαρίσατο, *gave*, as referring to the gift granted to the humanity of that which properly and originally pertained to the Deity alone, which was united with it at the Incarnation, and proved to be so united by the Resurrection. St. Peter (Acts ii. 36) supplies a perfect parallel to St. Paul's teaching in this place. The contrast also between ἁρπαγμόν, *robbery*, or *seizing*, and ἐχαρίσατο, *gave*, must not be overlooked. As the equality with God was not an act of grasping, so the latter was a gift. The result of this conferring of honour and exaltation is that all, not *things*, but *beings* in heaven and earth and under the earth, should do homage to the name and authority of Jesus, and acknowledge and adore Jesus Christ—the God-man—as Jehovah, to the glory of God the Father.

We would, in conclusion, render the whole passage thus:—

"Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who, subsisting in the form of God, did not deem equality with God a usurpation, but divested Himself by taking the form of servant, by becoming in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as man, He humbled by becoming obedient to death, the death, too, of the cross. Wherefore God also highly exalted Him, and gave Him the name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee of those in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth should bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is *Lord* (*i.e.*, Jehovah) to the glory of God the Father."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—In the PULPIT for October 4th your correspondent, "F. T. P." says: "I cannot pass by without a protest the statement that ἀνάληψις in St. Luke ix. 51 refers to the ascension of Christ. . . . Here the more natural meaning is not that of ascending into Heaven, for which the time had not fully come as the text asserts, but of ascending to the highlands of Jerusalem."

In saying so "F. T. P." is *entirely mistaken*, as the following quotations clearly show:—"ἀνάληψις can have but one meaning (which, as the word itself is not found elsewhere, must be determined by the sense of the cognate verb: see references, Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 2, 11, 22; x. 16: 1 Tim. iii. 16; 4 Kings ii. 10), His assumption, *i.e.*, ascension into Heaven" (*Alford*). "ἀναλήψεως, *assumtionis. Commoda appellatio. . . Unus erat dies assumtionis in cœlum*," etc. (*Bengel*). "The expression ἡμέραι τῆς ἀναλήψεως, in which the whole process of His exaltation, from the resurrection to the ascension, is included" (*Olshausen*). "ἀναλήψεως, His ascension" (*Bishop Wordsworth*). "The expression here is very remarkable: 'When the time was come that He should be received up,' which relates to His ascension to His glory in Heaven, He stedfastly set His face to go up to Jerusalem" (*Scott.*) I may repeat what I have already mentioned in a former letter, namely, that the cognate verb ἀναλαμβάνειν, in the phrase ἀναλημφθῆναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, occurs in the account of the ascension in Acts i. 11, which identical phrase is used of Elijah in 4 Kings ii. 11. And if "F. T. P." had closely studied the phraseology of the Greek Testament he would not have fallen a prey to the vain imagination of supposing that ἀνάληψις can have the meaning "of ascending to the highlands of Jerusalem." He would have learned that the word employed by the New Testament writers is ἀναβαίνειν as in Matt. xx. 18; Acts xviii. 22, in the latter of which places it is used absolutely.

While I look on the contributions offered by "F.T.P." as *luxuries* rather than necessaries, I have already said that any additional light he may be able to shed will not be unwelcome. But I must say that up to this time his commentary (where it has not been irrelevant) seems only calculated to envelop in mist what before was sufficiently clear.

2. "F. T. P." says "Mr. Heber Evans is fond of referring to Winer; well, but let us take Winer's opinion. He says (p. 46) . . . . the N.T. writers were not like Philo and Josephus acquainted with Greek literature." If I am fond of referring to Winer it s

only because he is the standard authority on Biblical Greek. The late Rev. W. H. Simcox ("The Language of the New Testament," 1889), says: "The books that I have made most practical use of, and had most constantly in my hands, were Winer's 'Grammar of New Testament Greek' in Dr. Moulton's translation, etc. .... Winer has never been superseded." I may add that it is to Dr. Moulton's edition of Winer that my references are made—the *ninth* English edition, based on the *sixth German* edition. As to the learning and style of the N.T. writers, Winer himself speaking of his predecessors (p. 30), says: "The difference between the styles of different authors was almost entirely lost sight of; .... in this inquiry Matthew, Luke, John, Paul, James, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot possibly be considered together." And the Dictionary of the Bible informs us that: "Whilst Hebraisms are frequent, classical idioms and Greek compound words abound. The number of words used by Luke only is unusually great, and many of them are compound words, for which there is classical authority." It is acknowledged that Luke was by far the most educated and literary of all the Evangelists. He was "*inter omnes evangelistas Græci sermonis eruditissimus*" (*Jerome*). Olshausen speaks of the preface of the Third Gospel as being "pure Greek"; and Bishop Wordsworth says of the writer's style: "*Oratio pura, simplex, inaffectata, elegantiam, fere Atticam redolens; et ab eo loquendi genere longe remota quod vernaculum erat Judæis .... Neque vero .... puriora tantum et exquisitiora vocabula quam cæteri consectatus fuisse videtur, sed verborum quoque formas venustiores adamâsse ... Apud illos ἐγάμησα reperias, apud hunc autem ἔγημα; et plurima alia sincerioris Atticismi exempla.*" Certainly, then, the writer of the Third Gospel, as an intelligent, educated travelled writer, who had spent much time in Greek cities, was not ignorant of the most famous Greek authors. And we may certainly safely "insinuate" that words used by Plato and Aristotle, and also Xenophon, Thucydides, Aristophanes and others were many of them "ordinary current coin in the days of St. Luke." "While modern Greek is indebted largely to Plato for its form, to Aristotle it owes much of its vocabulary" (Geldart, "Modern Greek," p. 99). Many words in the New Testament are to be found in the same sense in Aristophanes, who used colloquial Attic. "'The common dialect' is substantially a form of Attic." "The Language of the Hellenistic Jews .... is a form of .... the 'common dialect' of Greek" (Simcox). "On the one hand a literary prose language was formed, having the Attic dialect as its basis .... this is known as ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος. On the other hand there arose a language of common life, a popular spoken language..... This spoken Greek is the true basis of the language of the LXX. and the Apocrypha, and also of the New Testament language" (Winer). There is therefore no occasion to strike out of my argument, as "F. T. P." suggests, "a number of other references to the Greek Classical writings." The words in "Josephus, Philo, Plutarch, and the latter classics generally," which formed part and parcel of the current Greek language of the Evangelist's age, had many of them (as well as other words in the Third Gospel) been handed down by the above-mentioned more ancient classical writers.

3. "F. T. P." adds "Mr. Heber Evans slurs over somewhat the rather strong proof of the use of medical phraseology in the combination of δυσεντερία with πυρετοί, Acts xxviii. 8, and dissociating the words which should be taken together, as they are more than once so taken in the *Epidemics* of Hippocrates, he is satisfied," &c. I said in my letter in the PULPIT of September 13th, "Dr. Hobart, however, does not give any quotation, in which Hippocrates uses the plural πυρετοί with δυσεντερία as here." This statement *appears to be strictly correct;* and I also said, "πυρετοί, in the plural in the case of one person, is also used by Plato, who speaks in the *Timæus* of τεταρταῖοι πυρετοί =quartan fever, recurring every fourth day." My authority for this assertion is Liddell and Scott *s.v.* τεταρταῖος: "τεταρταῖοι πυρετοί quartan fever, Plato, Tim. 86 A." This appears to bear out my statement, but as I do not claim infallibility, I am quite willing to be corrected. What I complain of is that "F. T. P." instead of elucidating any doubtful point from his accumulated stores of medical lore only beguiles us by suggesting further doubt, and producing an atmosphere of haze. In fact, he can only be compared to a literary will-o'-the-wisp, tempting the plodding wayfarer far out of his right course. But even granted that some evidence of the medical character of the phrase were forthcoming, what would be gained? The foundation for Dr. Hobart's theory of medical authorship (although thus *largely* extended) would only amount to ONE *insignificant* word used *non-medically* in the Acts, namely, ἀνωτερικός (=upper) and TWO *dubious phrases* of the simplest character (which, if originated by the doctors, could not have been exclusively employed or enjoyed by them, but must soon have passed into common speech), namely, μέγας πυρετός (=a great fever), and πυρετὸς καὶ δυσεντερία (=fever and dysentery)—fever being a not unnatural concomitant of dysentery. This is but a poor unsubstantial basis for so weighty a theory.

4. "F. T. P." seems aggrieved that I do not devote myself to a minute study of the medical writings. I confess I am far more interested in the study of the Greek Testament, which appears to me to be of vastly greater importance, especially in these days. He persists in misapprehending my position. I am criticising one particular work, which advocates most thoroughly of all works I am acquainted with, the medical theory of authorship in the case of the Third Gospel. I venture to think that I have shown clearly that the arguments adduced by Dr. Hobart, and endorsed by Dr. Salmon, entirely fail to establish this theory. I very fearlessly submit the numerous facts I have brought forward to the judgment of all competent critics. We have Mr. Gladstone's authority for saying (what indeed seems perfectly obvious) that "Nothing can annihilate a fact."

H. HEBER EVANS.

October 4th, 1890.

CANON SCOTT-HOLLAND'S SERMON.

SIR,—Your issue of the 27th ult. contains a sermon by Canon Scott-Holland, in which occurs the sentence, "We can remember him in our prayers before God, we who live in the same Body of Christ of which He is still a member, we who partake of the same food, kneeling at our altar, as that by which His life is still fed, and His Spirit purified." Now, with all deference, I ask the learned Canon what he means by the words, "as that by which His life is still fed." Does he mean that spiritual food, whereby our souls are strengthned and refreshed in the Eucharist, *i.e.*,

the Body and Blood of Christ, received and eaten, by means of faith on our part, and on God's part conveyed to us through His appointed channels? Now if faith be an essential means for obtaining this sacramental food, then the soul of the late Canon is still capable of faith to enable it to partake of such spiritual refreshment, for all will admit that faith is necessary. And again, if the souls of the departed can exercise faith, then they are not merely passive, or at rest. If they are passive and incapable of action, then, according to the Canon's sermon, they can be fed and purified in their disembodied state, without the exercise of that faith which was essential to their obtaining the same food and sanctification when in their bodies. If they are not passive, but can still exercise faith, how do we know whether they require when out of the body, that which, when in the body was their food and sanctification. Where are we told in the Bible that departed souls have, and, if they have, can exercise this faith? It seems that now-a-days one may put forward as dogmatically as possible any private theory on matters about which we are, in the Bible at least, left in almost total ignorance.

A PLAIN MAN.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—Dr. Donaldson, writing in the PULPIT of 4th inst. in reply to a letter of mine in that of Sept. 20th, says that Abraham's works "were justifying works because a justifying faith wrought them; and that justifying faith received its perfection from those justifying works."

I assent to this, and I should have no need to reply, but for Dr. Donaldson prefacing this by writing, "Mr. Murphy now says that the Romish doctrine of justification by works is true." I said nothing in the least like this. What I wrote was "Justification by faith and justification by works are both taught in the New Testament," which is a mere statement of fact. But even if my words had fairly admitted of the interpretation he puts on them, it still would be wrong to quote me as using words that I had not used. Carelessness in quotation is a most dangerous fault.

He concludes his letter by speaking of "the great impropriety of saying that justification by faith is never taught in immediate connection with judgment." He does not—I suppose because he cannot—say it is false, and why then is it improper? A negative fact may be as instructive as a positive one, and this is instructive by showing how false is the notion that the main requirement is a "sound faith," in the sense of an accurate creed.

Dr. Donaldson's indignation with me for my undeniably true statements—statements of fact—must I think be due to a fear of the consequences of letting men's minds come into immediate contact with the difficulties of Holy Scripture.

The letter by "J. B.," following Dr. Donaldson's, induces me to mention a pamphlet that has been sent to me, entitled "Primitive Universalism illustrated by numerous quotations. Reprinted from chapters iv. and v. of Universalism Asserted." (Elliot Stock.) It presents a great mass of evidence to show that the "restoration of all things" (of Acts iii. 21, Revised Version) was the general belief of the Greek Fathers

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, Oct. 8th, 1890.

CANON LIDDON.

SIR,—This is the era of canonizing our departed, as Newman, Littledale, Maconochie, and now Liddon. A man may be very good, and yet very illogical. No safe guide, much less a Pope. I remember a sermon of Canon Liddon's, preached in St. Paul's, and published by you in 1884, which struck me at the time as most illogical, and dangerous. I will quote a sentence, "We cannot get nearer the truth than by saying that these elements, remaining in their natural substances, we get *veiled channels* of the Sacred Presence, which is plainly, in whatever sense, identified with them by the very word of Christ." I will only observe that Canon Liddon here differed from Littledale, who had the face to tell us that what the Prayer Book says remain in their very natural substances, are not the bread and wine, but only their accidents or appearances. Here Liddon is right, and Littledale wrong. But now for Canon Liddon's mistakes. He says the elements are veiled channels. This is nonsense, for they are outward and visible means or channels. Perhaps he meant *veiling* conduits But this is very slovenly writing for St. Paul's. But what follows is worse—"Veiled channels of the Sacred Presence, which is plainly, in whatever sense, identified with them by the very word of Christ." Sacred Presence! Very words of Christ! All our Lord said was, "This is my Body"—no word about "Sacred Presence" or, as it is said, soul and divinity. Now, I say that a man, who could write thus inaccurately on a subject that he had, I suppose, been studying for a great number of years, is wholly unfit to be made an oracle or infallible guide. I see the same slipperiness in the *Church Times*. One time it tells us that a corporeal presence may be held; and another time, September 5th, 1890, it makes the presence to be that "the virtue of the glorified body is extended"—though it generally sneers at this, as if it were mere virtualism. It would be better for us if we could make our own formularies our guides, and not these slippery gentlemen, whose brains have been turned by their flatterers and their own hunger for popularity.

C. C., V.-G.

THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH.

SIR,—In the PULPIT of the 27th ult., your correspondent, "J. B.", says that he "has not sufficient knowledge to decide" what should be the proper translation of *pneuma* in certain texts of Scripture; yet, notwithstanding this, he asserts his belief that our Lord had not a human spirit.

This manner of thinking and writing is, for many reasons, rather remarkable. The "insufficiency of his knowledge" forbids us to feel surprise at his inability to see that "flesh," in "the Word was made flesh," means human nature, and not merely a human body; and it also affords us a ground for believing his statement that the "reasons given by Bishop Pearson and Archdeacon Wilberforce, for the orthodox doctrine, are not convincing to *his* mind." Nor do we, for the same reason, marvel at the great inaccuracy of the terms which he uses in discussing this doctrine, when he speaks of a "spirit becoming inseparably mixed with the Divine Nature." "Mixed" is not the orthodox word.

His "insufficient knowledge," like a bad thread in a textile fabric, runs through his whole letter, vitiating

it in every particular, and showing the direful consequences that arise when a person meddles with doctrines concerning which he has little or no knowledge. His letter, therefore, points a good moral in this latter respect. R. DONALDSON.

October 4th, 1890.

THE LUX MUNDI CONTROVERSY.

SIR,—This question is still to be discussed. It is a favourite argument that, as it says in the Hebrews, because our Lord was "made perfect through sufferings," He was not perfect before. But this is quite a mistake. He was to suffer all; till this was ended His suffering was not perfect. Another passage is, "He learned obedience by the things that He suffered." Unless this means that our Lord was not always obedient, it can prove nothing. All it can mean is, that He went through a course of obedience, as He did of suffering. The idea that our Lord had to learn practical morality is perfectly appalling. In order to prove that our forms are inaccurate, it is said that the Creed ascribes to the Man Christ what St. John says was the work of the *Logos*. But the Creed says no such thing. When our Lord tells His disciples that "the Father hath put the times and seasons in His own power," this is made to assert our Lord's ignorance. Because our Lord says, that salt without its savour would be useless, this is also pressed into the service. Our Lord's knowledge of Nathanael's character and the Samaritan woman's history, is made out to be only what all great men have possessed in some degree. He had no knowledge of the events of the past history of the world beyond what the documents available in His time could give. When St. Paul says, "we know Christ after the flesh no more," this is made out to mean that "during His earthly sojourn He was still imperfect, and could not be the omnipotent and omniscient Ruler and Providence which he became after His resurrection." This is strange, as we have it from Acts i. 7, that even after His Resurrection He was still ignorant. Because in His childhood He grew in wisdom, this, we are told, implies that His ignorance continued after He had received the Spirit without measure. In fact, our Lord's ignorance is made to continue all the time of His teaching, so that we can learn nothing from it, or from the Apostles either unless they knew more than He. I need not speak of Jonah or Job. Of course parables may teach as well as history. But what our Lord calls history we are not to believe to be parables.

Once again, at His Baptism, it is said, was poured on Him the Spirit of holiness. How a perfectly sinless being could require such, surpasses ordinary comprehension; but I suppose that those who make assertions of this kind have authority and reasons for doing so. A CHURCHMAN.

THE BLACK RUBRIC AGAIN.

SIR,—I am well aware you dislike threshing questions out when there is no grain left. But the *Church Times* for this week again puts a false meaning on the Black Rubric. I know no paper, from *The Guardian* through the gamut down to the *Rock*, that would permit the question to be argued. But the question, whether or not there is anything on the Altar that ought to be adored, is at stake—the question which is exactly that for which Bonner and Co. burnt Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley. It is therefore the real *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*. So said a late sermon in the *Church Times*, and so say I. Now I must give you the words of the *Church Times*. "The Black Rubric is a protest against Impanation or material Transubstantion." This may stand; only that the 28th Article makes the subject of dispute *any change of substance at all*. This the *Church Times* denied some time ago, again and again in 1886, and said that it was against a change of accidents that the 28th Article was directed, and not at all against a mere change of substance.

But we must hear the editor on. "It the 'Black Rubric' contrasts the natural body, or corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood in heaven with the natural substance of the Sacramental bread and wine on earth." The contrast then is between the material substance of our Lord's body, and the material substance of the bread and wine. But that contrast then changes to another, between our Lord's material body in heaven, and the virtue of that body accompanying the bread to us on earth. For we read, as the editor proceeds, "the language is plain enough in the sense in (*sic*) which it is meant to bear, viz., as to the contrast between the actual body of Christ glorified, manifested to the saints in Heaven, and His mystical body, by which His presence is sacramentally extended throughout the world;" are there then two real bodies? "also the contrast between these (two) and the natural substances of bread and wine, under, and by means of which, the mystical body is given, and the *virtue* of the glorified body extended." Come! here we have that reviled idea of "virtualism," or the virtue conveyed by the bread and wine. "In speaking of Christ's natural body," the editor says, "they meant that body of glory whereby Christ is now manifested in heaven as man, and not the body of humiliation, which he naturally received through the Virgin Mary. The word 'natural' is loosely used, and not theologically." This is all nonsense. The body spoken of by Bonner, and also by Ridley, is the same body born of the Virgin and slain on Calvary, only made immortal and free from infirmity. What the *Church Times* is to tell us is this. Has our Lord's body *actual contact* with ours in the Eucharist? or is the presence of His body merely a presence of grace? All turns on this, all else is mere beating the air, and logomachy.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Canon and V.-G. of Kildare.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Awdry, Rev. Canon C. H., M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools and Chaplain at Hartham ; Rector of Hinton Parva, Wilts.

Baker, Rev. C. W. H., B.A., Curate of St. James's, Norlands, Notting-hill ; Rector of St. Clement's-with-St. Edmund's, Norwich.

Brown, Rev. R. P., M.A., Master of Kendal Grammar-School ; Licensed to officiate within the Diocese of Carlisle.

Chamney, Rev. Paul Martin, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Luke's, Richmond, Surrey.

Clarke, Rev. H. Lowther, M.A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Coney-street, York ; Vicar of Dewsbury.

Codd, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Rector of Stockton, Wilts.

Crookshank, Rev. Gerrard Alexander, M.A., Vicar of Ryston-cum-Roxham and Fordham, Norfolk.

Dugmore, Rev. Ernest Edward, M.A., Vicar of Parkstone, Dorset ; Prebendary of Gillingham Major in Salisbury Cathedral.

Gildea, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Netherby ; Rural Dean of Beaminster Portion.

Hodgson, Rev. F. R., Vicar of Frithelstock, Devonshire.

Jones, Rev. David, B.A., Vicar of Pwllheli, South Carnarvonshire ; Vicar of Llandegai, Bangor.

Lampen, Rev. C. Dudley, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Huddersfield ; Vicar of Eastry, near Dover.

Lees, Rev. George Wyld, M.A., Vicar of Clifford, Yorkshire.

Legh, Rev. H. Edmund, M.A., formerly Vicar of Leigh, Surrey ; Vicar of Steeple Standgate, Essex.

Leupolt, Rev. Samuel Theodore, M.A., Vicar of Tottenhill and Wormegay, Norfolk.

Lutener, Rev. William Maurice Bonnor, M.A., Incumbent of St. Mark's, Dunham, Massey, Altrincham.

Majendie, Rev. Severne Andrew Ashurst, M.A., Rector of Wimborne St. Giles, Dorset.

Mattinson, Rev. G. F., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's Mission, Knowle, Mirfield ; Rector of Lesnewth, Cornwall.

Moulder, Rev. T. J., Incumbent of Christ Church, Georgetown, Demerara ; Rector of St. Swithin's, Demerara.

Newman, Rev. Alfred Stilgoe, M.A., Curate of Emmanuel Church, Loughborough ; Rector of Tarrant Hinton, Dorset.

Oldfield, Rev. W. J., M.A., Curate of Mansfield, late Rector of St. Mary's, Belize, British Honduras, Commissary to the Bishop of Jamaica for British Honduras ; Principal of St. Paul's Mission House, Burgh.

Porte, Rev. John Robert, D.D., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Denmark-hill.

Price, Rev. Edwin, M.A., Minor Canon and Sacrist of Westminster Abbey, and Priest-in-Ordinary to the Queen ; Vicar of Bishop Auckland, Durham.

Ruxton, Rev. Holmes, Rector of Swefling, Suffolk.

Savory, Rev. Ernest Lloyd, Rector of Palgrave, Suffolk ; Chaplain to the Lord Mayor-elect (Mr. Alderman Savory).

Scott, Rev. R. John E., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Antigua, W.I. ; Rector of St. Paul's, Frederiksted, S. Croix, Danish West Indies.

Smith, Rev. Granville Vincent Vickers, M.A., Vicar of Swaffham, Norfolk.

Wyld, Rev. Edwin George, B.A., Vicar of Melksham-with-St. Andrew's Chapel, Wilts.

Yonge, Rev. Lyttelton Vernon, Curate of Hadley, Wellington, Salop ; Vicar of Rowton, Salop.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bennett, Rev. James Hatchard, Rector of Lydford, formerly Head Master of Solihull Grammar-School, at Lydford Rectory, Devon, on the 10th inst.

Burrow, Rev. Roger, at Houghton Rectory, Huntingdon, on the 11th inst., aged 64.

Cottingham, Rev. James, B.A., Vicar of Shotwick, on the 11th inst.

Dodd, Rev. John, for thirty-eight years Curate and Vicar of Lumley, at Lumley Vicarage, on the 8th inst., aged 61.

Holland, Rev. Edward, M.A., for thirty-nine years Rector of Camerton, at Camerton Rectory, near Bath, on the 10th inst., aged 79.

White, Rev. Henry, M.A., Chaplain of the Chapel Royal, Savoy, Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen, and Chaplain of the House of Commons, on the 7th inst., aged 57 years.

INTERESTING TO CRICKETERS.

MR. W. GUNN, the celebrated Nottingham professional, writing from the County Cricket Warehouse, 14, Carrington-street, Nottingham, 9th July, says :—"You will be glad to hear that the Electropathic Belt I had from you has quite cured the rheumatism that prevented me from playing foot-ball last winter ; and it has also been of great benefit in sustaining strength of nerve and endurance, which qualities are both of great importance to cricketers. The marvellous curative properties of this genuine Electric Belt are now well known. It gives wonderful support to the spine and internal organs of the body, is light and comfortable to wear, and may be relied upon to speedily invigorate the most debilitated constitution."

Descriptive illustrated pamphlet, book of testimonials, and consultation free, either personally or by letter, on application to the Medical Battery Company, Limited, 52, Oxford-st., London, W. (the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.)

WHAT ARE HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELTS?

"A Boon to Sufferers."

They are genuine curative Electric Belts, constructed upon the principle of the dry pile. They require no moisture other than that of the skin to put them in action, the contact with the body being quite sufficient for medical purposes. They comprise the perfection of the methods adopted by the celebrated Professor A. Humboldt and Dr. Burg, etc., and in every case where doctors usually prescribe a course of hydropathy, one of Harness' Electropathic Belts may be substituted with advantage. Acting, as they do, upon all the most important organs of the body, they rarely fail to alleviate most of the disorders resulting from local or general debility, impaired digestion, weak circulation, or defective organic action.

THESE GENUINE ELECTRIC BELTS

are exceedingly comfortable to wear, give wonderful support and vitality to the internal organs of the body, improve the figure, prevent chills, impart new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulate the organic action, promote the circulation, assist digestion, and promptly renew that vital energy the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Their healing properties are multifarious. They stimulate the functions of various organs, increase their secretions, give tone to muscle and nerves, relax morbid contractions, improve nutrition, and

RENEW EXHAUSTED NERVE FORCE.

Acting directly on the system, they sustain and assist its various functions, and thus promote the health and vigour of the entire frame.

Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELTS

have stood the test of nearly twenty-five years, have restored thousands of sufferers to health and vigour, are guaranteed to be perfectly genuine, and are constructed on sound scientific principles. The Medical Battery Company (Limited) are the Sole Proprietors and Manufacturers of these now world-famed Curative Appliances ; and, should any of our readers still have the least doubt as to their bonâ-fide character, they are invited to call without delay at the Company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street (at the corner of Rathbone-place), London, W., where they can see the Belts scientifically tested, and can personally examine the thousands of unsolicited testimonials and Press reports that have been received from all parts of the world.

The Church of England Pulpit.

IDEALS.

By the Rev. L. R. RAWNSLEY, M.A., Curate of Hornsey.

Sermon Preached in Hornsey Parish Church, on Sunday Evening, August 24th, 1890.

"The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God."—St. Luke xii. 16-21.

CHRIST'S parable of the Rich Fool was uttered to illustrate the truth with which it was prefaced, that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth. The lesson our Lord drew from the parable was that every one is foolish who lays up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God. It was God who said to the rich man, "Thou foolish one," for thus the Greek adjective is correctly rendered by the Revised Version. The farmer would probably have congratulated himself, and have been envied and looked up to by his neighbours. It would be true in his case, as in the case of one made suddenly rich, about whom we read in the 49th Psalm, "While he lived he blessed his soul; and men will praise thee when thou doest well to thyself." It will be prudent for us to examine the parable, and to discern the reason of the judgment God passed upon the farmer. He was not foolish because he was meaning to pull down his barns and to build greater. There was no folly in his resolve to take his ease, eat, drink, and be merry. Christ did not say, "So is he that layeth up treasure for himself." Such teaching would have appeared unreasonable and too hard. Our Lord did say, "So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God." Here you see wherein the folly of this man lay. He forgot God. In his plans for the future God was left out. He thought of his body, he thought of his animal life; but of his higher life, of his spirit, he took no heed. He might have lived many years, he might have taken his ease, have eaten and drunk and been merry; but if that had been all his care, he would still, in God's sight, have been foolish. He not only forgot God, but he also forgot death. He prepared to enjoy himself in this world; he never prepared himself for life in another world. Remember these two reasons for accounting him foolish—he forgot God, and he forgot death. This had been the case with Noah's contemporaries: "They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all." This had been the case with Lot's fellow-citizens in Sodom: "They did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them all." This was not the case with King Solomon's subjects. True, we read of them, "Judah and Israel were many as the sand which is by the sea in multitude, eating, and drinking, and making merry;" but they spent seven years in building the Temple for Jehovah, and sought, as far as it lay in man's power, to make it a worthy house for the Lord to put His name in.

God said to the rich man in the parable, "Thou foolish one." Let us rightly comprehend what this word implies. A foolish person is not one who is demented, and who is a terror to those who have the charge of him; neither is he one who is imbecile and unconscious of what he is saying and of what is going on around him. On the contrary, a foolish person mixes with his associates without inspiring them with dread; he understands what he is saying, and knows what others are engaged in, but he does not give things their due weight in his thoughts; he ignores some events, depreciates others, and over-estimates many. The Greek word translated "foolish one" means simply "without thought." A few simple illustrations of folly in this life and in matters of worldly wisdom will show us the nature of folly in spiritual matters. George Primrose is represented in Goldsmith's "Vicar of Wakefield" as going to Amsterdam to teach the Dutch English. It never occurred to him that it would be first necessary for him to learn Dutch. He showed his folly by leaving this point out of his consideration. Rehoboam sent Adoram, the officer who was over the tribute, to parley with the Ten Tribes who had revolted because their request for lighter taxes had been rejected. He had underestimated how deep-seated was the opposition to the heavy imposts, and his ambassador was stoned. The Jebusites thought the stronghold of Zion so impregnable that it could be defended by the lame and the blind. Their foolishness was as disastrous as Rehoboam's. To give one more common instance. Too many schoolboys think only of present ease and present enjoyment; their lessons are trifled with, because they would unduly indulge in sports, or slurred over because an exciting novel is more attractive. Those who think of the future that awaits these boys, and of life's stern realities

which they must face, warn them of their foolishness, but the warning falls too often on heedless ears.

It is similar in the spiritual world. Even as boys will take no thought for the future, as they will depreciate industry and exaggerate bodily prowess, so men and women will ignore God, take no account of spiritual development, and give undue prominence to the things which are seen and temporal, to the exclusion of the things which are unseen and eternal.

In your thoughts on this subject you must bear in mind that nobody thinks himself foolish in the present, either in worldly matters or in spiritual. People may awake and say, "How foolish we have been," and this awakening is very good for them; but nobody chooses his line of conduct and forms his ideal without being persuaded that he has chosen what is best for himself, and that his ideal is that which, if he could only obtain, he would be a happy and a satisfied man.

Will it not be good for us to examine our consciences this evening, and, after the solemnity of our evening service, and during these moments when we surrender ourselves to holy thoughts and accept counsel on heavenly truths, to say, each one of us, "How do I answer the question, 'What shall I do with my life?' Are the plans that I form for the future those which God would approve of? or would He say of my cherished schemes and of my fond ideals, 'These take no thought of God nor of death?' Would He say to me, 'Thou foolish one'?"

Solomon's advice was, "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths." It is by keeping this advice that the godly are known; and if we take it home to our own hearts, and act upon it, we shall not take any view of life which does not embrace God; we shall not form any ideals which do not satisfy our spiritual needs, as well as those of the body and the intellect. Do not let us ignore God. Let us in all our deliberations remember His omnipotence and His holiness. Let us look to Him as to our heavenly Father. Let us who are young, who see many paths which may lead to self-indulgence, self-love, and self-will, who hear the voices of pleasure, of fame, of popularity, of sloth, and are beckoned to by the world, the flesh, and the devil, let us remember our Creator in the days of our youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh when we shall say, "I have no pleasure in them." Do not let us give our youthful strength, and our ardent hopes, and our daily struggles, and our nightly thoughts to earthly delights, which the eye will not be satisfied with seeing, nor the ear with hearing. Let us beware lest we refuse to walk with God while we are young, and hurry along with the world-rulers of this darkness, and then, when our feet are tired and our spirits weary, and our companions leave us for the society of those young and gay as we once were, *then* we call to God to support us with His strength and to solace us with His love. Oh, the shame! that many mean to offer God the dregs of their life, to call on Him when they feel the need of His help; but they do not mean to offer their service to God and to be His soldiers when their loyalty could promote His kingdom!

God's omnipotence, God's holiness, God's fatherhood, these are some thoughts of God which should be before us. One other must be included, God's redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ. From the most perfect bliss, from the ideal home, and from the ideal glory, we believe that Christ was sent, a voluntary Saviour and Redeemer, by His Father. We believe that He lived to teach us true life, that He offered Himself both in His life and in His death, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God. Do not ignore this when you say, "What shall I do with my life? What ideal shall I set before me?" Seek, then, to be rich towards God. Lay not up for yourselves treasure upon the earth, where the rust and moth doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal. St. Paul spake of the Apostles as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things. St. James spake of the poor as rich in faith. St. John tells that the church in Smyrna was outwardly poor, and yet deemed rich; that the church of the Laodiceans was rich in its own eyes and poor in the eyes of God. Such passages show us that heavenly riches will be those qualities which we can carry away with us out of this world—faith, hope, love, and all those fruits of the spirit, which are from above and endure unto eternal life. Take God and take death into your schemes for the present and the future. Christ alone has the words of eternal life. To whom will ye go wisely, if ye unwisely turn from Him? What will it profit you if you gain the whole world and lose your own soul? Listen to the words of one of the most religious of America's poets:—

> "Art is long, and time is fleeting,
> And our hearts, though stout and brave,
> Still, like muffled drums, are beating
> Funeral marches to the grave.
>
> "Trust no future, howe'er pleasant,
> Let the dead past bury its dead,
> Act, act in the living present!
> Heart within, and God o'erhead."

We must lay up treasure in heaven, we must be rich towards God, we must develop our spiritual faculties, but we shall be foolish if we neglect the body and the intellect. Give due thought to these; give due thought to your family and to your business, but "seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness." May such be our chief aim in life. It is necessary to insist upon it, be-

cause so many are now living unmindful of God. It is still true that "the ungodly careth not for God, neither is God in all his thoughts." Some are living to make money; others to get all the pleasure they can out of their lives; others to mix in as good society as they can obtain access to; others are greedy of fame and popularity. Their chief happiness is to see their names in the newspapers, to make a big score at cricket, to be elected to an official position in their club, to be spoken of as intellectual or as charming, to be cheered and to be fêted. Such people ignore God; they also ignore death. In this world they might find enjoyment, not of the highest order, yet still satisfying to them; but this world must pass away, with the lust thereof. It can well be imagined to-day that some who believe in God and in Christ, and yet take no pains to grow in faith and in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus, would think, though they would not put their thought into words, that Jesus had indeed endured much for them, and was worthy of all love; but that, as they prefer to follow their own inclinations, they wish that they were not indebted to Him, and were free to follow their own natural bent. They would be content if the pleasures of this life would endure, and they could live here in an earthly paradise. It is vain to wish that the laws of our being could be altered; it is folly to live as if they were altered. God's law is, "first that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual." This law is as invariable as the physical law, first boyhood, then manhood. We may say with Byron, "Oh! happy years, once more, who would not be a boy"? but it would be degradation to live as if we were boys. Growth is the universal law of our being. It is folly to ignore it in the physical world; it is greater folly to ignore it in the spiritual world.

Besides those who ignore God, there are those who dethrone Him in their thoughts, and who put another monarch on His throne, while they allow God to stand by. Miss Procter long ago warned men of the false genius who

> "Bid men bow before
> Crowned mind, and nothing more,
> The great idol men adore."

And a similar warning is needed to-day to bid men beware of the tendency to enrich the intellect at the expense of the spirit and the heart, and to unduly advance science and knowledge.

> "Who loves not knowledge? Who shall rail
> Against her beauty? May she mix
> With men and prosper! Who shall fix
> Her pillars? Let her work prevail."

But

> "Let her know her place;
> She is the second not the first.
>
> "A higher hand must make her mild,
> If all be not in vain, and guide
> Her footsteps, moving side by side
> With wisdom, like the younger child.
>
> "For she is earthly of the mind,
> But wisdom heavenly of the soul."

Intellect, alas! is not the only rival that is set up above the spirit. Men let their lower natures gain the sovereignty over them, or are even content to lead a life of anarchy, with no guiding principle. You talk to them about God. They tell you that they know all that. They are not laying up treasure in heaven. They may think of God's infinite greatness, and forget His infinite care. They enjoy that care; they are blessed by His providence. He looks that they should bring forth grapes, and, lo! they bring forth wild grapes.

Those of you who are familiar with Canon Kingsley's novel "Yeast," will remember that when the hero of the story began to examine into the condition of the agricultural labourer, he could find no solution of the question till he took up a book of Mr. Carlyle's, and there read "The beginning and the end of what is the matter with us in these days is—that *we have forgotten God*." Let not that be the matter with us to-day. Like the rich farmer we may have found life pleasant and successful. We might ask what more we need seek than a continuation of the old life yet more pleasant and more successful. This life will pass away, and the life of the world to come must be entered upon. To many death is the King of Terrors, as the ruthless lord who will banish them from all they love; to others who have the fear of God before their eyes, he is the gracious messenger who will summon them from their earthly cares to the court where God reigns for ever and ever. Form your ideals, young men, and see that they be noble ones. Confine not your thoughts to your work, to your prospect of higher wages, to your sports, to the marriage that is one day to crown you with joy. Rise, young women, to higher thoughts than the fulfilment of your household tasks, the pleasures of society, the home and wedded happiness that is to be. Let those thoughts be in your hearts if you will, but subject them to thoughts of God, of responsibility, and duty. Fathers and mothers, strive to do the best for your children, but forget not that the best you can do for them is to bring them up in the fear of the Lord, and that, as in the case of the tribe of Levi, the service of the Lord is a better inheritance than land or money. Other ideals may never be realised, but if you hunger and thirst after righteousness you will be filled. Do not spend money for that which is not bread, and labour for that which satisfieth not. Call upon your soul to bless the Lord, and to forget not all His benefits. Count all things but loss to win Christ, and to know the power of His resurrection. Seek God in prayer, and ask Him for daily bread, and for deliverance from evil, but pray before all things, with the fervour of one who lives his prayers, "Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come."

REVERENCE.

By the Rev. JOHN A. JENNINGS, M.A., Rector of Donaghpatrick.

The substance of a Sermon Preached in Donaghpatrick Church, Diocese of Meath, on Sunday, October 12th, 1890.

"Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence."—Hebrews xii., part of v. 28.

YOU will remember that on last Sunday morning I said that two crying needs of the present time were Thankfulness and Reverence. I then preached on the former want; to-day let me say some words on the latter.

The reason why I have selected the text which I have just read to you is that it brings these two needs before us at one glance, for if you look at your Revised Version of this passage, and its marginal reference—which, in this instance, follows the renderings of the best commentators—you will see that it reads thus: "Let us have thankfulness, whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with reverence and awe."

The true order is thus emphasised, for thankfulness is the school in which reverence is learned; it is when we realise that to God we owe ourselves, our souls, and bodies, and everything which we possess, that we see ourselves as we really are, and in some measure God as He really is, and thus are bowed down in awe-struck godly fear before Him.

It may seem a truism to say that the age in which we live is flippant and irreverent, but though this fact is painfully evident, yet it is little noted. The reason seems to be that the age, as an age, does not recognise in whose omnipresence it is standing; for what is reverence? Is it not, when it is of the highest kind, adoration in the presence of what is transcendently higher than the being who offers it?

Even in the case of our fellow-man we often times feel true reverence, though of different quality to that which goes forth to God. All through *In Memoriam* we trace this spirit toward the poet's dearest dead, as when he says, "I had such reverence for his blame." It is well to recognise this, for want of it towards those who are older than we, towards ripe experience, towards men placed by God in position of leadership, leads in the end to lack of reverence to the Almighty Himself.

In the second morning lesson read on last Sunday occur the words, "Let the wife see that she reverence her husband." Why does the Apostle so insist on this? Because true love has in it the element of respect, and therefore no woman ought to marry one whom she cannot thus regard. It is not that she would have no voice in the management of affairs, nor that she would not have full entrance into the sympathies and difficulties of her husband, for any man requiring so unreasonable and unreasoning an attitude would at once forfeit all right to that reverence to which he laid claim. As we learn divine love through the human, so it is through due reverence to whom reverence is due that we become steeped in that spirit toward Him who is the Creator and Preserver of mankind.

Do the young reverence the old—sons their parents, as they ought to do? I fear not. Let the terms "old fogey" and "Governor" answer the question by a sad negative. Such expressions may create a smile, but they are terribly typical of the degeneracy of the time; they are slight tokens, yet they suffice like the proverbial straw to show in what quarter the beginnings of the storm are rising. Believe me, it is from such small commencements, if unchecked, that social anarchy will spring. Then comes the slough of scepticism, and then the downfall of a nation.

Increasing knowledge should have a precisely opposite tendency—it is when it is a spurious or misdirected knowledge that irreverence is its result—for the more we know, we see that we know the less; as we learn deeper lessons we become aware that we have not yet mastered the very alphabet; we become more humble-minded; we are wholly conscious that we are pigmies as we direct our gaze toward Him who fashioned us; we cry out in the intense realisation of our littleness and unknowingness—

> "Let knowledge grow from more to more,
> But more of reverence in us dwell;
> That mind and soul, according well,
> May make one music as before.
>
> "But vaster. We are fools and slight;
> We mock Thee when we do not fear:
> But help Thy foolish ones to bear;
> Help Thy vain worlds to bear Thy light."

Yes, this is the cry which, when answered, lifts us above the conquered years, and yet places us at the footstool of God in the very ecstasy of awe-struck reverence and adoring love. The words of the prophet become *our* words too—"Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour."

Oh for more of this reverence in our irreverent day!

There is one great teacher of reverence if we but heed her voice, even Nature herself.

Day after day over the mountains. Having gained the summit, nothing of animated life is in sight—one sea of red-brown heather with the limitless arch of heaven over it. What teachings come? Vastness, and that means God; Silence, and that silence breathes of God; Solitude, and that solitude is the voice of God. What feeling comes? That of the patriarch of old time: "How dreadful is this place! this is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." Then suddenly, as in a flash—"Only my Creator and this weak animated clod, *myself*, are here. Myself—

my soul—will never die. I shall in that Great Day, amid the assembled multitude which no man can number, be as much a unit as now, as much alone with God as now. Shall I call to the rocks, "Fall on me, and hide me from the face of Him that sitteth on the Throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb? or shall I, with trembling gratitude and wondering awe, stand before Him, a sinner saved by His great love?"

And so the love and the personality of God bring thankfulness too deep for words—awe too great for human expression; and bowing down with bared head and trembling knees, the soul goes up in unlanguaged praise, in an agony of wondering amaze that He should deign to speak to *me*, to love *me*, and to send His Son to die for *me*—a mote, a speck on His universe, but dear to Him in that my soul is His creation. Thus reverence comes stealing and yet rushing o'er my senses until I see in Whose presence I am, and what a feeble, unworthy being this *myself* really is.

> "How Thou cans't think so well of us,
> Yet be the God Thou art;
> Is darkness to my intellect,
> But sunshine to my heart."

These three factors, then—the vastness of Nature, the loneliness of self, and the awful though loving presence and voice of God—produce reverence intense and deep. Therefore, cultivate Nature to lift the soul to its great first cause, and so shall the reverent spirit come to you in the silences of God.

We feel somewhat similarly at other times also. Perhaps we are pacing some cathedral aisle, in the felt stillness we tread the time-worn flags beneath the cold grey arches; a sudden chord, tender and soft and sweet, may peal from the organ; a sudden ray of sunshine may ripple across the pavement at our feet; and a sense of the Majesty on high steeps the soul, we bend in lowly reverence, we feel our restlessness borne away, our souls surrounded by His eternal rest.

Perhaps we stand in the silence of the presence of death, as we see the waxen face, the lips from which nor breath nor sound comes forth, we realise that to God we owe every breath that we breathe; thus in the sense of powerlessness His power is proclaimed, and to Him is absolute reverence felt.

Perhaps in the whirl of daily annoyances and petty cares, the necessity for a help that is not of man, is borne in upon the soul; the sight of Him Who is invisible is vouchsafed, in the light of that beatific vision, the keenest worldly events of gladness or of unrest are as nothing beside the love of God, are of utter worthlessness beneath His frown or smile; even those great things which go to form the history of a nation, what are they beside our eternal life?

> "Raving politics, never at rest—as this poor earth's pale history runs,
> What is it all but a trouble of ants in the gleam of a million million of suns?"

Nothing here—real as it all is—is as anything compared to the reality of God; and when we *know* this, it is *then* that we can truly say, "Holy and reverend is His name." An easy assent will be given to all this, but *do we live it out?* Are we an exception to the age? If "holy and reverend is His name," do we ever take that holy name in vain? I do not mean are we guilty of the sin of profane swearing. I should hope that there are none here who are partakers in such a flagrant form of evil; but do we utter God's name lightly, carelessly, thoughtlessly? or, is it to us "a name that is above every name"? The Jews by all means in their power avoided the very mention of *Jehovah*, using one of two other names when naming God; this was from reverence, although it degenerated into superstition; yet have we the right part of this feeling within us? I fear not.

I do not want pharisaism. God forbid that any words of mine should lead to unreality; but I do ask for reverence, proceeding from reverence, forming an integral portion of our inner life. Are we each thoroughly reverent in the house of God? You know that we, in Ireland, see Roman Catholicism as it really is, and it is not a pleasant study. But this constitutes our danger; for, in avoiding Scylla, we may make shipwreck in Charybdis. In dread of too much outward form and ceremonial display which, in that system, almost usurps the place of spiritual worship, we too often are devoid of even the seemly reverence which spiritual hearts would naturally prompt us to show when within a house dedicated and wholly set apart to the worship of God.

We desire no elaborate ritual; we oppose all that is merely outward in contradistinction to the soul-service of God; but I feel—and I speak to myself quite as much as to you—that *at least* from the time we enter these walls to the time when we are outside them once more, we should with the Holy Spirit's aid strive to think of Him; to abstract our thoughts from ordinary daily concerns, not to allow pleasure or business to have a hold upon us when we ostensibly are specially in the Almighty's presence; not before or after service to talk to one another of the ordinary concerns of the week; and ever in our attitude and behaviour to show that we endeavour to "offer service well-pleasing to God, with reverence and awe."

If this were our aspect, I am convinced that we would feel the Sunday blessing far more deeply, and would be able with our hearts to utter—"It was good for us to have been there."

God give us, added to living faith and glowing love, holy reverence and godly awe. Thus shall we live in the unseen, going about our daily round in the felt presence of Him who will still every weary throbbing, and calm the fiercest tempest-blast; walking with awe-struck reverent love, clothed with the shielding raiment of His eternal peace.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1890.

"GENERAL" BOOTH'S PROPAGANDA.

TO express disapproval of what has received the clamorous approval of the many, is to incur the imputation of prejudice or even of bigotry. Many grave, dignified churchmen, in their desire to exercise to the full the virtue of Christian charity, have spoken and written indulgently of the methods of the Salvation Army, and that body has at length obtained recognition as a large and powerful sect. That it is numerically strong no one will deny; that it is powerful in its hold upon the emotions of a certain section of society is also undeniable. That it is a sect "General" Booth absolutely refuses to grant, and he now arrogates to it the rights of the Catholic Church, to the exclusion of other bodies of Christian workers. During the past few days, "General" Booth has made two great bids for popularity, and he is now almost deluged with unthinking and thoughtless adulation. At the risk of being considered personally unkind, which is not our intention, we must say that the public funeral of Mrs. Booth—a woman evidently of great piety—was altogether too theatrical for followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. No practical business purpose was served by it, or otherwise the glamourous display might have been pardoned on the risky assumption that the end justifies the means. The Salvation Army is well in evidence in every street, on every day, and at all hours. The parade of numbers could only be intended to demonstrate the power of "General" Booth's organization, and, spiritually, to intimidate the infidels, very much on the same principle as a Mahometan procession in Turkey. One is, however, unwillingly led to wonder whether "General" Booth would have published his book at this juncture if the death of his wife had not afforded him the opportunity for such a large preliminary advertisement of it. Let us not be misunderstood. We gladly assign to the Salvation Army the field of work and influence it long ago selected. So long as the same spirit exists we must admit diversity of gifts, and though to us the Lord may not be in the fire or the tempest, we are glad that the fire and the tempest can reach some natures. It is perhaps not a dignified idea of Christian liberty to imagine it acquired through coercion and terror. But the Potter moulds according to material and uses, and the clay must not complain. What we do enter our protest against is the devouring spirit which has lately been evinced by "General" Booth, and which seems to savour more of carnal ambition than of spiritual humility. And against this aggressive programme, it is the duty of reflecting Churchmen to raise their voices.

"General" Booth's book, "In Darkest England," is a marvellous production. It is said to have been partly written by Mr. W. T. Stead, the late editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and it certainly bears the stamp of his original, powerful, fanciful, and—must it be said—fanatical mind. But then "General" Booth and Mr. Stead, are, though very diverse, yet very much alike. They would both have created the world in six days of twenty four hours, and not by the deliberate processes of nature, here a little and there a little. In this book they propose, and propose seriously, a programme which is to be carried out by the Salvation Army, and which "General" Booth apparently believes will secure the social regeneration of mankind. But for the egoism which pervades it, one might look upon it as a beautiful dream, for everything good is beautiful, and it is surely good to lift men out of the mire of degradation. When, however, the light of common sense is let in upon this dream, the sight is as unwholesome as the back of a stage during the production of a transformation scene, and one cannot but think that some of the outcasts hoisted as by a crane into positions of eminence in the world of respectability, are more than a little uncomfortable and have not had time to cleanse themselves from impurities. "General" Booth, however, does not apparently recognise the free agency of his subjects. The Utopia he has pictured is not a republic, but a despotism more absolute than that of Muscovy. He props his drunken men up with so hard a slam, and wedges them together so tightly, that they cannot fall. And he is to be the absolute ruler.

It is very curious that a scheme so dangerous to religion, so perversive of all civil and religious liberty—for which Nonconformists in particular have been sticklers for generations — should be received, so to speak, open-mouthed by large numbers of really good men. Surely they do not reflect upon the variance with Divine methods here displayed! To our mind there is positive irreverence in the scheme propounded by "General"

Booth. If we are Christians, we must give in our adhesion to Christ's plan of salvation rather than to "General" Booth's. There were sick and blind, lame and devil-possessed persons in Judea and Galilee, when the Son of Man sojourned there, and His heart was full of pity, and He healed them. There were hungry persons for whose benefit He performed miracles. But He sent them all away. He did not attempt to make a Colony of them, founding His claims to their allegiance on the temporal benefits He had conferred. Through all ages, however, His followers, with mistaken zeal, have endeavoured to make converts by material means. The monasteries held a grip upon the poor by their charities; even our own Church swelled its number of members by doles; and Nonconformists have all sorts of provisions for poor members. If these charities were not employed for proselytising, or for holding men by the power of the senses instead of in the bonds of faith, they would be kindly, and would benefit Christianity indirectly. But to our thinking, these methods are so totally opposed to the teaching of the Saviour as to be rather the promptings of Antichrist.

The opinion we have expressed is, we are aware, unpopular. The many see nothing but good in "General" Booth's scheme. Already lightly earned money is being showered upon him for its elucidation. Already vigorous measures are being taken for massing an army of conscripts, undisciplined, untaught, to whom Christianity is a thoughtless conquest, and not a patient endurance —to whom the legend "godliness is profitable to all things" means "remain a member of the Salvation Army and your bread shall be given you and your water be sure." Is there no one in the Established Church or in the ranks of Nonconformity imbued with the spirit of Eliphaz the Temanite, who asked "Can a man be profitable unto God as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself?"

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

AN UNSCIENTIFIC VIEW OF CREATION AND THE FALL OF SATAN AND OF MAN.

MAY I be permitted to consult your learned readers on my view of the Creation and the cause of the fall of Satan, as I hold a somewhat different view to Milton's?

The first thought carries me to the time prior to the Creation, when God in council with Himself (the Ever Blessed Trinity) determines to make a world, and to create another Being (Man) yet more beautiful than the angels. God, Omniscient, foresaw that if He did did so, Lucifer would rebel. God's will and purpose cannot be changed, and though war may break out in heaven, it could not and should not interfere with the Divine purpose, determining to effect this by the rule of His justice and not by mere Omnipotence. He permits Lucifer to fall that He might therein more thoroughly vindicate His Majesty; yet to provide against Satan and the forseen evils, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Jesus assenting thereto) is ordained to be the Saviour of the world.

Now let us try and picture to ourselves the Creation. "The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the waters." Whether there was a race of men prior to Adam, little matters, for geologists tell us that the animal life prior to Creation could not exist in the atmosphere of to-day. Adam was a *special* creation, and that is enough. The first scene shows us God by His Spirit moving over the waters, and the work is done. And God, pleased as each work is completed, declares that it is good. In Gen. i. 26, the Holy Trinity seem to me to hold a further council, and to consider whether anything more perfect shall be made. and it is agreed Man shall be made in their own likeness. This is done by the same process by which He made the rest of the world, and He makes man out of the dust, not out of Himself, but only in His own likeness, therefore we must look upon this Creation as of the highest quality, and, I venture to think, superior to the angels, for we are told they are ministering servants to the heirs of salvation. What an exquisite body Adam must have had!

God is wisdom, and He gave man wisdom to enjoy the eternity which belongs to God, and which by the gift of an endless life, enabled man to share a partnership with God. As St. Chrysostom, vol. 14, Lib. Fathers, 126, writes, "The term fulness, he used of the Godhead, like, as St. John says, of His fulness have we all received. That is whether the Son, or the word, there dwelt not a sort of energy, but a substance, *i.e.*, not wisdom only." God in giving wisdom to Adam gave him what the angels did not possess. Wisdom is not only knowledge, but a foreknowledge; the angels have no more knowledge than a servant has of his master's plans. Lucifer was not omniscient, though he held a high rank in heaven, and he and his companions are so inferior to the Divine wisdom, that God charges them with folly, for we do not read of God taking them into His Council—and this not necessarily asking their advice, but permitting them to know the Council of His Will, as in the case of Abraham, Gen. xviii. 17. And Dr. Donne in sermon, Acts xx. 25, says, "St. Chrysostom says St. Paul was only 4 ft. 6 in. in stature, yet his head reached to the highest heaven, his eyes saw and his ear heard the counsels of God."

With the life given to the Body we see the Image

of God in the character, wisdom, of man, of which the upright attitude of the body is the outward sign. Possibly in this first and second act of creation, man's soul had capacity only for the world, but, *afterwards in the third act*, by the Inspiration of the Spirit he would have comprehension for spiritual desires. The sacred blood bearing in some mysterious way the Image of God (Gen. ix. 6.) Thus far we have, so I think, seen only the work of the two Persons, yet in the likeness, there is, as it were, a vein of spirituality running through man, to be afterwards strengthened and perfected, so far as the first Adam was capable of perfection, or at least perfect for Eden.

In the 1st chapter after each act the work is called good. But this expression is not applied to Adam; in the xxvi. 26 God speaks of Adam as "them." Rom. iv. 17, Knowing that He had determined upon the Creation of Eve; and in the 29th verse God hands over all that He had created to the care of Adam, and tells him that all is very good. God does more than call Adam good, He blesses him.

Here, thus far, let me recapitulate my thoughts. Man, in the first acts of Creation, would possess reason and capacity for the world, and be a servant of God; but by inspiration *afterwards* become a companion of God.

The work stands thus :—

1. The Father. Creator of the body, σωμα.
2. The Son. Originator of the soul, ψυχη.

Then afterwards :—

3. The Holy Ghost. The Inspirer of the spirit, πνευμα.

And all not by individual operation independent of each other, but in mutual consent, the Unity of the Godhead being unbroken.

And do we not see a parallel to all this in the Perfect Man? The second Adam—Christ Jesus. 1. His body quickened by the Spirit rises again. 2. He comes to the Upper Chamber and breathes on His Apostles, and 3 afterwards sends down the Spirit at Pentecost; and, again, Man—1 Created, 2 Regenerated, 3 Restored; or, again—1 The world, 2 The Church, 3 Heaven. These steps corresponding.

But before we come to the third point or special work of the Holy Spirit, we must pause for a moment and notice that rest follows work. God having finished His labour, He returns to the family of angels in heaven, and they seeing Him pleased and satisfied (Job xxxviii. 7), welcome Him (The Blessed Trinity); but among the number there seems to be one who, with his followers, broods apart, and wonders "What is this that God hath done?" And as he thinks, his pride is awakened and roused to jealousy, he asks his followers, "Who is this that God has made in His own likeness, and to come between us and Him? Nothing shall stand between God and us. I will see to this work and destroy it. It is better to reign in hell than serve 'The man' in heaven, or that man on earth." In all this we see a motive for the rebellion, and it may be the war was not declared till Adam was called upon to name the animals, then Lucifer understood the likeness in Adam to God, in the power to command—a power acknowledged by the animals in their obedience; and here it may be remarked that though the Image has been so defaced by sin, yet it still exercises a power over them by their dread of man, such is the reverence they still have for the likeness once perfect.

Here, too, let us consider Satan or Lucifer. Though there are those who say that prior to the fall

> "Nature was red in tooth and claw
> And Dragons of the prime
> That tare each other in the slime."

Therefore there must have been an author of this evil, possibly, but it was to construct a world out of chaos that darkness gave way to light. But beyond the fact that the world was made for Adam we need not trouble ourselves. But then the question is asked what is "απ' αρχης" (St. John viii. 44.) When was this beginning? I answer Gen. i. 1. In the beginning, that is at the Creation. Wisdom ii. 23, 24, "God created man to be immortal, and made him to be the image of His own eternity, nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world." This marks the time, a period within eternity. Eternity has no beginning or end; this world has, and time shall be no more.

The envy of the devil then urges him to plot the death of Adam. We see a motive, and why permitted to be carried out I cannot say, beyond what I have written before, viz., that the triumph of God may be the more complete. Thus I believe the tree of knowledge, the tree of evil, was in some cunning way planted by the Devil, who in some mysterious way can transform himself and appear in exquisite beauty Ezekiel xxviii. 13. All the expressions of being clothed are surely not to be looked upon as mere figures of speech, such as "be clothed with humility," "put on the armour of righteousness, etc," clothed as "with a garment of cursing." A chapter might be written on this. It does not appear the angels in heaven ever learned the reason of Satan's pride and revolt. They still seem to have an imperfect understanding of the redemption of man, and to think the restoration will only be to Paradise. Our Lord seems to show this in the remarkable expression in the parable of the Prodigal Son—when the Father speaking to the Elder Son, "Son, thou art ever with me," speaks to the angels in heaven. No *man* can have been said to have been always at home, but the angels rejoice in heaven at the restoration of man to Paradise. The joy of heaven has yet to come (Heb. xi. 40). The triumph of the Lord when complete is well shown in the astonishment of the Elder Son.

War having been declared, we see why God made what may be called the inner circle (Rev. xii. 9), when God cast Satan out into the earth. Adam had had full range of the world, which was Eden, but now Adam must be brought into a place of safety, he must be put in a chosen place—"a garden planted eastward in Eden," and in this garden Adam was sustained by the tree of life. Adam being thus fenced in, Satan could not destroy God's work from without, he must try and do so from within, and thus he plants the tree of knowledge, and this tree is pointed out by God to Adam who is at the same time warned of the consequence, should he eat of it. As Milton says, Adam and Eve are not "to taste that only tree of knowledge planted *by* the tree of life,"—probably at the time Paradise was made for Adam, Hell was made for the devil and his angels.

Milton describes Satan as a great and powerful person, and clever as cunning; but fearfully dangerous though he be, yet has he any claim to wisdom, or anything more than subtlety? he has no conceptive mind, no originality of thought—he can plot no evil against man but by imitation. God gives a tree of life, Satan plants the tree of death. Jesus offers His Body and Blood to be eaten, Satan says "Do not eat." All through the Bible we see this same opposition

And when Jesus comes into the world Satan seems to be utterly ignorant as to the Messiah, and can only secure His death by the wholesale massacre of the Innocents ; and in this destruction he supposed he had accomplished his purpose. But Jesus is hidden in the darkness of Egypt, where Satan would never think of looking for Him. As Jesus grows to manhood Satan looks upon Him only as an ordinary man ; and it is not until the baptism by John, when the heavens were opened, that Satan knew for certain that Jesus lived. Then follows the Battle of the Temptation, which Jesus gained ; and after this Satan never seems again to enter into *personal* conflict with Christ, though he ceases not to assail Him through his agents, or even men and those of his own household. Satan is the very Judas of heaven.

Genesis i. to ii. 3 describes what I call the first act of Creation. In i. 19 the permission to eat is unrestricted. The revolt in heaven brings restriction and a law. At ii. 7 I read the third Act. The Spirit in larger measure is poured out to strengthen man for the warfare against Satan. In the eighth verse the trees of the garden are given for man's use, and a reminder is added, "The tree of life also in the *midst* of the garden" This tree, like the water of the rock, which flowed after the children of Israel, and which Rock was Christ, may in like wonderful manner have been always near Adam, but now it is placed in the midst of the garden, wherever Adam is, it is his duty to come to this tree for Spiritual nourishment, and he is warned not to touch the tree of knowledge. In the sixteenth verse the order is renewed, all fruit is to be at his service, and in the seventeenth he is told of the exception and the danger.

It cannot be supposed a fountain can give out sweet and bitter waters. Nor can it be supposed God would have planted the tree of evil to tempt man. He had blessed the work, surely now He cannot curse it. To prove the work would be to doubt Himself (James i. 13) : "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man." The cunningness of Satan leads him to plant the tree of evil. Now that man is to be attacked, it is not right that he should be alone, so a helpmeet is to be found for him ; and as soon as Satan can, he approaches the woman, evidently when she is alone. Satan insinuates a doubt of what Adam has told her. He seems to say to Eve, "God does not really understand the nature of this tree, for if thou eatest thou shalt not surely die ; He is only jealous of you, for He knows it will only make you wise like Himself." Now does not this mode of tempting show that God had not planted the tree of evil? Eve has never seen death, or a withered leaf; she has never known sickness ; had she ever known sleep, death's twin brother? The angels ever watch, and man is made in the likeness of Him who neither slumbers nor sleeps" Then persuaded she yields, and thus the fall of Adam.

It is my opinion that before the fall Adam and Eve wore a garment ; but against this may be brought forward Gen. ii. 25, they were both naked and not ashamed. If the objector takes this *carnal* and literal view, he is anticipating the fall, and I may ask, in equally carnal manner, could they not have worn a *coa vestis?* But, guided by the Transfiguration story, I feel at liberty to think of Adam and Eve in a state of purity and incorruptibility, wearing "the white and glistening raiment" of righteousness, which was the sevenfold gift of the Spirit, and which was torn and mangled by the fall, Satan absolutely destroying truth by a lie and life by death. But He who was the Way came and restored this loss and repaired the injury to the other portions. After the fall the exquisite body of Adam was congested, became carnal, and was held under sin. So St. Paul tells us (2 Cor. v.) that we would be unclothed, desiring to be clothed upon that this present mortality may be swallowed up of life. Though the spirit of man was so damaged by the fall that it was almost lost, it survived in Noah, and again at the Dispersion was still further obscured, yet surviving in Abraham, and through him in the chosen people. When Jesus condescended to come to earth, He did not have a new body made for Him, as for the first Adam. He could have done so, but then it would not have been Adam's body, but a similar body, a body in the likeness of Adam. So He in His mercy takes from the Virgin Mary, his mother, the body which Adam had after the fall, that in it He may bear the sins of the whole world, and that He might feel for and know exactly the infirmities of man, and in and by Himself be able to restore the body of man to that purity which it had before the fall. Though at twelve years of age He longed to be about His Father's business, yet He submitted Himself to His earthly parents till the time came for Him to manifest Himself to the world, and that was when John Baptist called the world to repentance, and He, bearing the sins of the world, came forth to tread the wine-press alone. Sin must have hid Him from His heavenly Father. To wash this sin away, He comes to Jordan, and John at once recognises the Lamb of God. Should the Holiest come to the Sinful? But Jesus commands, "Suffer it to be so now. I have accepted the burden of man ; through Me he must learn the necessity of repentance and regeneration." John Baptist obeys, the heavens are opened, and Jesus, the second Adam, stands forth as the Perfect Man.

> "Oh, generous love! that flesh and blood, which did in Adam fail,
> Should strive afresh against the foe, and, striving, should prevail."

By the divine perfection He is able mysteriously to pass through crowds, or to walk on the sea, or to show Himself in transfiguration. His body was not to see corruption, He was only to submit to death ; therefore His soul was not weighed down. On the Cross He empties Himself—(1) as a body, (2) of the soul (by His blood), (3) of the Spirit (by the water). The material body is laid in the ground by pious hands ; Jesus descends to Paradise, and on rising again retakes the human body, never to see corruption, ever pure and fitted for heaven—fitted for a better place than Eden, and that we by Him might take a place above the angels. Jesus had shown the glory of the only begotten Son to the chosen three at the Transfiguration, and they had not told any one about it, so the other Apostles would wonder marvellously at His appearance after His resurrection, and by the unbelief of Thomas He proved to them the reality of His body.

> "And that a greater gift than grace
> Should flesh and blood refine,
> God's presence, and His very self
> And essence all divine."

All this will enable us to carry our minds back to Adam and Eve in the garden, and we can think upon them as having bodies like unto Jesus's glorified

body, possessing no corruption, and fit to be companions of God.

The way, then, to our restoration is made plain in Jesus Christ. May God in His mercy grant us grace to find it. C. J. W.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CLEARING THE ATMOSPHERE.

SIR,—There have appeared lately, in the columns of the PULPIT, three letters under the above heading, which would have been more fitly entitled Darkening the Atmosphere, because therein the writer endeavours to bespatter with calumny the fair fame of the great and holy dead.

I do not know how many more letters of the same strain are yet to come ; but it appears to me to be time to try and retard the velocity of his progress in this unholy work. Before doing so directly, I would like to draw the attention of your readers to the eleemosynary method by which he tries to ventilate his theories. He says "I shall be particularly gratified if some of your contributors, *better qualified* than myself, will bring forward their views on the historical aspect of this great and deeply interesting question." Now, if he does not feel himself "properly qualified" to gauge the length and breadth of his principles, why does he come forward in this begging attitude to entreat other people to help him to the belief of his own opinions ?

But his conduct is strangely inconsistent with his principles. He believes in the final restoration theory ; that every body and every thing will be made all right in the end ; that good will finally triumph over evil ; that the "whole intelligent creation" will be ultimately saved. Why then does he not fold his arms in the self-complacency arising from this thought? Surely, on this principle, Augustin can not do him, nor any one else, any harm, because he and all the rest will be finally saved. Augustin will be saved, and all the people who believed his doctrines ; and those doctrines, if they be false, will all be destroyed. To be consistent, therefore, he should never raise his voice against Augustin or his doctrines ; he should never speak against vice or error, but rather should he take comfort in the thought that all will be right in the end. He should say to himself, "What matters a few millions of years, in comparison with eternity, to pour souls undergoing 'remedial correction' in the flames of a purgatorial fire ?' They will come all right out of it, and the bliss of the post-eternity will make up for all the pains they endured." And still further, in his consistency, he should say to the preachers of Christ's Gospel, "Why trouble yourselves preaching salvation by faith in Christ? It matters not whether men believe or not—whether they are saved now or not ; they will all be saved in the end" ! Indeed, he should go further still, and say that he sees no necessity at all for the machinery of churches, nor the Gospel plan of salvation !

Such are some of the dreadful consequences that come from this unholy doctrine. But it is quite otherwise with those who believe the final restoration theory to be a most "damnable heresy," and that those who propagate it are aiders and abettors of the "old serpent" in his wicked work of destroying souls. Because, if a man believes there is no hell, *when there is one*, and has the misfortune to fall into that hell, out of which he never can come, he has made an eternally deplorable mistake. This is the orthodox doctrine ; we therefore warn every man to "flee from the wrath to come ;" by showing men that there is no necessity for them to go to hell ; either that of "J. B.," or any other, in order to suffer a "limited castigation," or "remedial correction" of any kind. We further tell them that the means provided for their salvation are ready at hand, and are all-powerful, being nothing less than the almighty power of God. We "are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," for it is the *power of God* unto salvation" ; and we know that it is "*God that worketh in us*, both to will and to do, of His good pleasure." And we hesitate not to say that mental derangement has reached its climax when some men ask others to prefer the Gospel of a purgatorial fire to the Gospel of the power of God. What more can we have than the power of God, exerted immediately and directly on our souls for their purification ? It is blasphemously absurd to pretend that fire can do for men's souls in perdition what the power of God cannot do for them here. Paganism, in its darkest days of intellectual culture had no grosser, nor more irrational idea, than that a material fire could cleanse an immaterial spirit from moral corruption ! The notion is too ridiculous even for a passing notice. The almighty power of God being present now and here to heal men's souls, the issue limits itself to this question, Can men get a better means of salvation ?

But what is the root and origin of "J. B.'s" antipathy to the historical character of Augustin ? Simply this, that being unable to upset Augustin's principles by the force of valid argument, he thinks that by blackening his character he will make his principles to be less influential ? Could any undertaking be more uncharitable ? But there is an inner origin, a deeper root still. He tells us that "more than thirty years ago an irresistible conviction came to him, and has never left him since, that God would vanquish all evil by the superior energy of moral good." "An irresistible conviction" ! That is to say, he makes his mental condition at one period of his life, the standard by which to measure the creed of Christendom ! A creed that was in existence censuries before he was born. What an opinion the man must have of himself ! Did ever more silly talk appear in the columns of a respectable paper ? But let us come directly to the points of his letters. He quotes Neander and Milman as saying that Augustin's conduct toward the Donatists and Pelagians contained "the germ of persecution"; that "Augustinian theology was enforced on the Church by the interference of the civil powers"; that "physical force and severe penalties were employed to prevent open intellectual opposition."

There is no truth in all this. Augustin was not the *first* to invoke the civil power. Canon Robertson, a much better authority in matters of Church history than Milman, Neander, or the American Beechers, tells us in Vol. I., page 272, of his "History of the Christian Church," that it was first made by the Donatists. He says : "Even such an application to the civil power—a request that it would appoint a commission of ecclesiastical judges—was altogether inconsistent with the attitude which the Donatists after assumed towards the State, and their adversaries

did not fail in later times to remind them from which party the *original* appeal to the emperor had proceeded." Nor did the emperor interfere on religious grounds. The same authority tells in Vol. II., p. 137, that "although doctrinal discussions as to the being of the Church were afterwards introduced into it, it was at first merely a question of disputed facts ; and it had continued to engage the attention of the emperors, not in its *doctrinal aspect*, but because the disorders of the Circumcellions disturbed the peace of Africa."

It is a gross fabrication to say that "physical force" was used by Augustin to silence intellectual opposition. He often invited the Donatists to "Conferences, but was repelled by the obstinate bigotry of the sect." No rescript was issued against Pelagius till after his principles were examined by an "African Synod of more than two hundred bishops, when *nine canons* were passed, which were afterwards generally accepted throughout the Church, and came to be regarded as the most *important bulwark* against Pelagianism," Vol. II., page 150. It does not look like silencing open intellectual opposition by "physical force" to invite a man to an open discussion of his principles in a full synod of two hundred bishops. And, in order to understand the relations of the civil power to the Church in this particular, we must remember what Gieseler tells us, that "the emperors raised the decisions of synods into laws of the empire, and enforced them accordingly"; and also that his motive, as Canon Robertson tells us, was "*to allow in religion a freedom of thought limited only by the necessities of civil government.*"

Augustin knew that there could not be two orthodox Catholic Churches ; and when a full synod, in free discussion, had determined what the orthodox doctrine was, then he simply said to the Pelagians, "You cannot continue to occupy a place as teachers in the Church while you hold such doctrines. You must do the only *honest* thing that is possible in the case ; you must give up either one or the other." And when they refused to leave the Church, he brought into operation a principle that was in full swing before his time, namely, the interference of the civil power. But excommunicating a man for heresy, and at the same time giving him leave to hold his opinions elsewhere, is not persecution in the usual meaning of the word. Even an inspired Apostle could say, "I wish they were even cut off that trouble you." What better plan at the time could have been adopted in order to preserve the unity and purity of the Church? Neander and Milman might as well say that St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith in Christ contained the germ of Antinomianism, because certain heretical persons arose in after times who abused the Apostle's doctrine, as to say that Augustin's calling in the aid of the civil power—which was usual at that time—contained the germ of persecution, because the Papists in after times abused that principle. Every good principle has its abuse. And if the interference of the civil power in matters of religion be a crime, then the constitution of the grand old Church of England is a huge blunder! This is apparent in many ways, but especially from his Majesty's declaration, prefixed to the Articles in the Book of Common Prayer, wherein he styles himself "*Defender of the Faith*, and *Supreme Governor* of the Church within these our Dominions." He goes on to say that those "Articles do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England ; from which he will not *endure any varying or departing in the least degree.*" And adds, that if there be any offenders in this respect, they "shall be liable to his displeasure, and the Church's censure, and that he will see there shall be due execution upon them." So that any one preaching contrary to these Articles is liable to the exercise of "physical force," and the infliction of "severe penalties." A church totally independent of the State is an absurd fiction : because no church can exist as a corporate body if a violation of its doctrines be not visited with some kind of punishment ; and the ultimate appeal in all cases of refractory ecclesiastics is to the civil power.

Even allowing that Augustin was wrong in soliciting the intervention of the civil power, that does not prove the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked to be erroneous : its truth or falsehood must be tested by a higher authority. But if it be condemned on this ground, then many other articles of the creed must be condemned with it. Witness, for instance, the confusion in the Arian controversy. Hagenbach tells us Pelagius asserted at the Synod of Diospolis that the punishment of the wicked was eternal : that *æternis eos ignibus esse exurendos.* How then could Augustine use physical force against him for believing on this point precisely as he did himself? Hagenbach goes on to say that "the doctrine of the restoration of all things shared the fate of Origenism, and made its appearance in after ages only in connection with *other heretical* notions, especially Millenarianism." R. DONALDSON.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—It would be to little purpose to discuss the subject of Confirmation Grace with one who does not hold the Baptismal Regeneration doctrine—not that of *opus operatum*, but the orthodox. If Grace is not bestowed at baptism, a Sacrament of our Lord's institution, it is consistent enough to deny it in confirmation, an ordinance—I do not and did not insist that it is a Sacrament—of Apostolic institution. Mr. Sandlands, however, gives a reason for disbelieving Confirmation Grace, on which I think I should remark. He sees sundry who have been confirmed, and yet lead ungodly lives. That is, he denies that there has been Grace conferred, because the effects that it ought to produce are not patent. This appears to me to be walking by sight and not by faith.

To clear myself, I must express dissent from the metaphysics of your esteemed correspondent. He speaks of faith, reason, and instinct as of principles belonging to the same category. I think it erroneous to call them principles at all ; and I do not regard them of the same category. Instinct is a faculty that men have in common with the lower animals. Reason is a faculty that men have and animals have not ; but which men have in common with God, of course in less degree, and by which they apprehend Him. Faith is not a faculty in any sense ; it is the exercise of the spiritual faculty, which is itself the highest part of the reason. I look on these and the like distinctions as of some importance. Regard for them would save us from the frequent error, an absolute and most irrational one, of treating reason and faith as being opposite, or as being capable of being opposed. A power and an exercise of that power are different things and kinds of things.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Porthkerry ; Rural Dean of the Western Division of the Llandaff Lower Deanery.
Barton, Rev. Charles Hairby, Vicar of Water Houses, Durham ; Vicar of St. Mary Lowerby, Halifax.
Bell, Rev. Waldegrave D., M.A., Assistant-Chaplain of St. Michael's, Chester-square ; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester.
Best, Rev. John D., M.A., Principal of Derby Diocesan Training College ; Principal of the Training College, Chester.
Bigg-Wither, Rev. R. F., M.A., Rector of Worting ; Rural Dean of the Basingstoke South-West Deanery.
Blyth, Rev. T. A., B.D., Vicar of Stoke, Coventry, and Chaplain of Coventry (City) Union ; Commissary in England to the Bishop of Niagara.
Buck, Rev. R. E. S., Rector of St. Allen, Cornwall.
Cooke, Rev. Arthur Henry, B.A., Rector of Trevalga, Cornwall.
Cromwell, Rev. Canon, M.A., late Principal of St. Mark's College, Chelsea ; Rural Dean of Braintree.
Davidson, Rev. L., M.A., Rector of Chedburgh ; Rector of Stanton St. John, Oxford.
Dunn, Rev. James Oliver, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Wolverhampton ; Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Codsall, Staffordshire.
Duncan, Rev. J. Collins, Organising Secretary for the Church Missionary Society in the Cambridge district.
Evans, Rev. Leonard Henry, M.A., Vicar of Ford, Herefordshire (to hold by dispensation with Hope Vicarage).
Evans, Rev. Walter, Vicar of Halkyn, near Holywell ; Rector of Castle-Caereinion, Welshpool.
Green, Rev. A. J. M., M.A., Rector of Castle-Caereinion ; Vicar of Halkyn, near Holywell.
Hall, Rev. Frederic John, M.A., Vicar of Little Wymondley, Herts.
Hardy, Rev. Thomas Barker, M.A., Vicar of Bulwell, Nottingham.
Hughes, Rev. F. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Hastings.
Johnstone, Rev. C. J., M.A., Vicar of Milton Abbas ; Organising Secretary for S.P.C.K. for Salisbury Diocese.
Johnstone, Rev. D. Ewart, LL.B., Vicar of Lenton, Grantham ; Diocesan Secretary of the Church of England Central Society for Providing Homes for Waifs and Strays.
Lambert, Rev. F. Fox, M.A., Rector of Clothall ; Vicar of Cheshunt, Herts.
Lewis, Rev. Henry, Principal of Culham Training College ; Rector of East Hendred, Wantage.
Lilley, Rev. William, Curate of All Saints', Liverpool ; Vicar of St. Mary's, Boulton, Derby.
Lindsay, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Stalisfield ; Rector of East Langdon, Dover.
Marks, Rev. Heber, Curate ; Perpetual Curate of St. Thomas's, Manchester.
Milner, Rev. Thomas Rogerson, Rector of Donyatt, Somersetshire.
Packer, Rev. C., Vicar of St. Paul's, Leftwich ; Chaplain to the Northwich Union Workhouse.
Patten, Rev. F. W., B.A., Vicar of St. Mary-le-Gill-with-Paltisforth, near Colne.
Ping, Rev. Andrew, Curate of St. George's, Leeds ; Vicar of St. Jude's, Nottingham.
Proctor, Rev. H., M.A., Vicar of Coleford ; Principal of the Training College at Fishponds, Bristol.
Scholefield, Rev. James Henry, M.A., Vicar of Mullyon, Cornwall.
Seaman, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Northwood, I.W. ; Rector of Stalbridge, Dorset.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Austin, Rev. John Southgate, M.A., formerly Vicar of the Leigh, near Cheltenham, at 11, St. James's-square, Bath, on the 13th inst., aged 76.
Bagge, Rev. Philip Salisbury, Rector at Walpole St. Peter, on the 18th inst.
Barker, Rev. John Thomas, for twenty-two years Rector of Rushden, at Doveridge Vicarage, Derby, on the 16th inst., aged 63.
Clutton-Brock, Rev. Thomas Henry, Vicar of Marden, on the 8th inst., aged 56.
Holmes-Orr, Rev. William, Rector at West Lydford Rectory, Somerset, suddenly, from syncope, on the 15th inst., aged 67.

A BOOK FOR MEN AND WOMEN.

A little book of considerable interest to both men and women is published (gratis) by the Medical Battery Co., Limited, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. It is carefully compiled, and contains much valuable information on "The Remarkable Curative Action of Electricity," with a special chapter on Mr. Harness' genuine Electropathic Belt Appliances. Those who cannot call should write at once to the above address before they forget it. A copy, with book of testimonials, will be sent post free on application.

MR. MIDDLETON'S REMARKABLE CASE.

The case of Mr. George Middleton is worthy of the most careful consideration. Writing from 66, Holborn Viaduct, he explains how one of Mr. Harness' Electropathic Belts completely cured him of severe organic weakness and general debility, after the leading London physicians had failed to do him any good. In a long letter of gratitude he describes the result as "astonishing," and says that he now has "a good appetite," is "able to walk in comfort," and gets "good sleep at night." He further states that he will be glad to answer any enquiries, or do anything in his power to bring these genuine and convenient electric appliances more prominently before the notice of his suffering fellow-creatures. Thousands of similar testimonials have been received from all parts of the world and from all classes of society, copies of which are published in book form, and may be had free by post on application to the Medical Battery Company, Limited, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. Any of our readers who may be suffering from nervous exhaustion, organic weakness, physical debility, impaired vitality, melancholia, hypochondriasis, indigestion, gout, rheumatism, sciatica, lumbago, epilepsy, torpid liver, hysteria, kidney diseases, sleeplessness, loss of appetite, rupture, corpulency, &c., should not fail to call, if possible, at the Company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation. Those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call, should communicate by letter without delay, when a descriptive illustrated pamphle and private consultation form will be sent them gratis and post free to any address. We may add that this palatial establishment is the largest and only complete electro-therapeutic in the world, and the public should avoid all fraudulent and worthless imitations. Note carefully that the Company's only address is 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), where their officers are in daily attendance from 9 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. ; Saturdays till 4 p.m.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

By the Lord Bishop of MANCHESTER.

Sermon Preached at the opening of the Hull Church Congress.

"We know in part, and we prophesy in part."—1 Cor. xiii. 9.

IT is universally acknowledged amongst us that in the religious teaching of the Old Testament we can discern a gradual development. God not only spake to the fathers in the old time "in many parts and in many modes," but also with a largeness of truth and spirituality of feeling which, on the whole, increased through the ages until the great revelation of the fulness of the times. So much is admitted. The law of development unquestionably prevailed under the old covenant. Shall we then say that it ceased to have validity when that covenant came to a close, or that it passed over as a rule of the new order, at the coming of the Christ? In one respect this must be denied. The revelation given to us of the nature of God and of His relation to us in Jesus Christ was final and complete. The great spiritual truths of our Lord's teaching are as unchangeable as His divinity. The age will never come when it will be less true than it is to-day that God is our Father, that man is our brother, that love is the law of our life, that Christ died to save us from our sins, and that from His throne above He sent His Holy Spirit to make us partakers of His holiness. Nay more, whatever changes time may bring in the scope of our ethical thought and practice it will never obliterate those eternal lines of human duty which have been laid down once for all in the Sermon on the Mount.

But although the revelation of the Father in the Son be thus final and unchangeable, it by no means follows that our understanding and exposition of that revelation are so. "We know in part, and we prophesy in part." Our Lord's words may be simple and plain, but too often we read them without intelligent apprehension. A kind of mist rests on them, springing from the steaming marsh of our own worldly life, or our spiritual vision is obscured by narrow capacity, and the misleading suggestions of current habits and opinions. Thus, although the Lord's words may admit neither of change nor improvement, it may well be that His Church's grasp and representation of them, like the teaching of the prophets of old time, may be the subject of growth and development.

Now, an imperfect apprehension and statement of the truth will necessarily contain good and evil, perfect and imperfect elements.

Such a combination is manifestly susceptible of improvement, and will, in fact, approach more nearly to the truth which it has only partially expressed, if in process of time it drops more and more of those evil or imperfect elements which have been added by the sin or error of human interpreters. Is there, then, reason for hoping that this may actually be the course of Christian thought—that as the centuries pass it will drop more and more of the impure mixtures of human haste and prejudice, and come nearer in love and insight to the simple teaching of our Divine Master?

I think that such a hope is plainly suggested by the promise of the Lord Jesus that He will be with His people "all the days, even till the end of the age;" and yet more plainly by His promise of another Comforter Whose office it should be "to bear witness of Him; to bring to remembrance all which He had said; to take of His, and show it to His disciples." Under the guidance and illumination of this Spirit, then, we may confidently hope that the reason and conscience of the Christian Church will constantly strive to exclude whatever of false or evil has come down to it from darker or less faithful ages; and that, though this struggle may be often frustrated or hindered by unbelief or misfortune, it will never cease. Remembering indeed the weakness of man and the vicissitudes of history, we must not expect too much from it in any special age. There will naturally be ebbings and flowings in that tide of Christian thought which seeks to cover with its fertilising waters the waste places of the world's ignorance. Even when heathen resistance has been overcome obstacles may arise from the immaturity of Christian thought and feeling. Beliefs which the reason suspects and challenges may have become so dear and venerable by long entertainment, may have offered so grateful a shade to the generations which they sheltered, that the heart will cling to them in spite of misgivings.

This conservatism indeed of the emotions, while appearing to retard the progress of truth, may not be wholly without its use and place. It holds back the stronger and more eager spirits, and prevents them from rushing forward so fast and so far as to pass out of the sight and reach of the lagging masses of the race. It thus helps to keep up the solidarity of humankind, and secures that unity of thought and interest without which such a thing as corporate development would be impossible.

In spite, however, of all these drawbacks of human weakness, error, and affection, I believe it to be true, as has been said by a well-known

philosopher of our own time, that "our historical inheritance of religion is richer in the elements of moral truth and power than any ever entrusted to any previous age." Nay, I think that it is not impossible to indicate roughly the great stages of progress through which that inheritance has been reached. I do not, of course, mean that there has been a regular and continuous succession of such stages, or, again, that there has ever been any one age in which many of the essential aspects of Christian truth have been totally obscured.

He who ventured on such a statement would speedily be contradicted by enthusiastic specialists, who would have no difficulty in showing him that even in the darkest times individuals or small communities recognised clearly what the majority of their fellow-Christians were neglecting. In spite, however, of all such exceptions and irregularities, it will not be difficult, I believe, to discern in the history of the Church the traces of a real development of Christian doctrine. This development, it is true, has often been of a very partial kind.

Of the contents of revelation different ages have taken special portions as the object of their careful study and exposition. They have spent their whole energy upon the task of exploring and determining the precise meaning of some single class of truths, and have too often not only suffered other fundamental verities to be neglected, but, their own self-imposed task accomplished, have sunk into mental and spiritual lethargy, leaving the future work of development to be undertaken by another and unexhausted generation of believers.

Thus it was the special task of the early centuries of the Christian era to determine the Scriptural doctrine upon the nature and relations of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Then, with the irruption of the barbarians, a dense cloud of darkness passed over the rational heaven of the Church, and the great problem of the nature of man, and of its relation to the grace of God, already opened and illuminated by the genius of Augustine, was dropped, with much else; while minds were narrowed, and knowledge dwindled, and worship hardened into formality, and thought lost itself in scholastic trivialities. It was a period of rational ebb and decline. The ages, however, as they passed were not altogether unfruitful. Noxious weeds of superstition might indeed flourish in the darkness, but at the same time minds were gathering power, spiritual needs and aspirations were making themselves felt, and in the great schools of the later middle age men began to ask once more what were the spiritual means and benefits of redemption, and what the conditions of their use and attainment by sinful men. It is no more than might have been expected that, in that age of rudimentary spiritual development, attention should have been largely directed to those outward means and ordinances through which the life of Christ was offered to human faith; or that, in an exaggerated estimate of the value of these, the minister should have become the priest, and the sacraments the supposed scenes and channels of magical operations. The less these earth-bound souls felt within themselves the power to see and grasp the spiritual and heavenly, the more did they long to have their conscious spiritual impotence supported by something which was perceptible to sense.

Once again, in the dawn of the Renaissance, human thought went forth eagerly on the quest of truth in every direction, and in none with greater boldness and enthusiasm than in that which was so familiar, the way of revealed religion. After ages of neglect, the newly opened Word of God spoke to them with the force and freshness of an audible voice from heaven. It reached depths of their soul which had hardly yet been sounded, it touched feelings and stimulated capacities which had slumbered for centuries, thus filling life with interest and work with sanctity. In the dazzling light of this intellectual re-birth priestly authority and sacramental miracles became not only less credible, but less desirable. Awaking to new spiritual needs and capacities, men sought a directer and a diviner mode of communion with heaven, and they found in St. Paul's gospel of salvation by faith the very revelation which they sought.

The centre of interest and effort was suddenly changed. It was found not in the Church and the sacraments, valuable and necessary as these might be, but in the believing soul, the living temple of God, that consecrated scene of penitent efforts and divine approaches and joy-inspiring triumphs, which angels desired to look into.

Once again, tired by its mighty effort, and losing interest in what it thoroughly grasped and defined, the reason and conscience of the Church seemed to sink into a kind of lethargy. Thought lost its freedom, and the heart its joy, and to the dry, dogmatic age which followed the Reformation the Bible became little better than a miraculous oracle, and life nothing more than a petty theatre of mean, secular interests, in which at length men felt it hardly worth their while to play a part. Then came the great Evangelical revival, taking all kinds of outward forms, now known as Quietism, now as Methodism, and now as Evangelicalism; but everywhere essentially the same—a revival rather than an advance.

As at an earlier time, it concentrated attention on the individual soul, on the subjective appropriation of salvation—stopping too often at the gaining of heavenly gifts and experiences, without going on to insist decisively on the appointed divine end of such gains. Had the great change come? Was the man converted? Had he laid hold on Christ? Had he experienced the joy of adoption? These were the main questions, and with the answers to these interest and effort too often ended. Nay, so

blind were many good men of that period, and so proud of their blindness, that the very imperfection and fragmentariness of their conceptions seemed to them a special merit.

To confine attention to the work of Christ, to the offer of pardon and life in Him, and to the acceptance of that offer by faith was called preaching the Gospel.

To go further, to call attention to the fact that the work of Christ, the ministry of the Spirit, the ordinances of the Church, yea and the subjective moods of mind and heart which appropriated the benefits of these were all only means to an end—the reproduction in each man of the image of Christ; and hence to make much of the revealed features of that image, and of the daily Divine discipline, effort, and abstinence by which it might be perfected; all this was looked upon with suspicion, as a departure from the simplicity of the truth, as legalism, formalism, or even a magnifying of human merit to the disparagement of the grace of God. What wonder that so crippling and injurious a mistake provoked a violent reaction, and even a contempt which would have been more loudly expressed but for the respect inspired by the characters of good and holy men?

But now once more, in our own days we are beholding what I believe is not merely a revival of lost truths, but a distinct advance in the human apprehension of the Gospel. Without losing sight of the vast importance of past gains, of the dogmatic definitions of the early centuries, of the later discovery of the preciousness of the means of grace, or of the mighty grasp of reforming times upon the critical importance of a realising faith; we are now discerning, I believe, more clearly than ever before, that all these are concerned mainly with what is preparatory and instrumental, with what looks forward to a great spiritual end: the realisation in the heart, in the Church, and in the State of the ideal set before us in our Lord's life and teaching. The signs of such a development may be discerned, I believe, in many directions.

First, in the much greater proportion of attention which is directed to the personal teaching and example of our Divine Master.

We feel instinctively that the dogmatic teaching of St. Paul's epistles, though by no means exhausted, has been very largely apprehended and realised. True, it is not the less important for that; but it is on this account a less necessary and interesting object of attention. In the teaching and life of our Divine Master, on the other hand, we feel that there are depths which have never yet been sounded, lessons which have never yet been learnt, light for our perplexity which has yet to spring forth and illuminate the heaven of our thought and practice.

It is with us in this respect very much as it was with the Hebrews in respect of our Lord's priesthood and sacrifice. No one can say that the doctrines of "repentance from dead works," of "faith toward God," of "resurrection from the dead," and of "eternal judgment" are not of first-rate and eternal significance; but they had been apprehended and realised, and so to the Hebrews had become rudimentary and almost self-evident. There was little need of insisting upon them. Powerful temptations had given a greater claim upon attention to the true meaning of that priestly and sacrificial system of the law of Moses which threatened to draw away the thoughts of believers from the one all-sufficient sacrifice, and to reimpose the broken yokes of the ceremonial law.

It was necessary then, in order to secure what had been already gained, that an advance should be made to the better knowledge of other truths, as yet but imperfectly apprehended.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, a like necessity is felt in the Church of the present day—a necessity which proclaims itself in such exclamations as these — "Christianity is a personal religion," "Christ is Christianity," "We want now not St. Paul, but St. Paul's Divine Master." Nay, the urgency of this need is felt not only in the old Churches of Europe, but also in those heathen lands which are being awakened from the sleep of centuries by the light, now painfully striking upon weak eyes, of European thought and civilisation. What is the report with which missionaries have been startling the minds of thoughtful Christians? That they are met everywhere, in India and Africa alike, with the demand, "Tell us about Jesus: tell us what He said and did; let us hear the words of love which go straight to our hearts; which are so like what is good in our old creeds, and yet so much better than the best which they taught us." All this surely means that the four Gospels will be studied in our days as they have never been studied before; with an eagerness and a seriousness which have their birth in the felt needs of a larger thought and a deeper humanity.

Secondly, I believe that the social movements of our own time—themselves largely due to the Gospel—are enabling us to gain a better understanding of the meaning of Christ's words. For ages we have been so much under the dominion of prevailing thoughts and habits that we have been literally unable to believe that the Lord meant what He said. Men who loved Him lived lives so utterly unlike that which He set forth by His teaching and example, that we have felt it necessary to bring precept and practice into some sort of tolerable harmony, by all kinds of ingenious and non-natural interpretations. The Lord could not—so it has seemed to us—He could not have meant His words to be taken literally.

Such an acceptance of them would involve nothing less than a social revolution, a change which would unsettle everything, and let loose upon the children of peace all the destructive forces of selfish passion. That the Lord intended to create

a vast social change, that He meant by the arms of love to conquer all the wild impulses of selfish passion, seems hardly to have been conceivable. I cannot say that all this has been changed—that would mean what is called the millennium—but assuredly all is changing.

I have lived for more than sixty years, and I can remember the time when to have required employers to consider, in fixing wages, in arranging workshops, in building cottages, in determining the hours of labour, not only profits, but also, and more, the physical, moral, and spiritual welfare of working men, would have been looked upon as a kind of lunacy. Christ might, indeed, have said that one human soul was of more value than the whole world; but that, no doubt, was a kind of Oriental figure, and, at any rate, it was no concern of those who took the trouble of prosecuting worldly labours in order to make money. No change whatever has been made in the words of Christ, but how much more those words have come to mean to us, through the reluctant recognition which has been forced upon all, partly by the teaching of great humanitarians, and partly by the combination of labourers, that after all man is more than money, that character is greater than possessions, that human truth and honour, purity, and love are more than all the victories of war, or the accumulations of peace. What, again, could seem to be more Utopian than our Lord's command, "When thou makest a dinner, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours . . . . but call the poor, the maimed, the lame and the blind." We are far enough yet, it is true, with all the luxuries and extravagances of our London seasons, from laying that precept to heart, but at least the movements of our time have brought some kind of obedience to it within more measurable distance. We do see rich ladies in large numbers going down into the poorest slums of our cities, to carry to the least fortunate of the race the help of Christian love and the light of Christian refinement. We do see noble-hearted men giving up all the enjoyments of a brilliant society to live in the midst of the wretched and depraved, and to find a deeper delight in the restoration to miserable outcasts of the lost image of God than any which the world can offer. We do see colleges and public schools establishing or assisting Christian Missions to the ignorant, the depraved, and the fallen, and eagerly contributing not only money but sympathy and personal aid to make the love of Christ a living succour where succour is most needed. In the light thrown upon our Master's words by such movements as these we are almost beginning to believe that He meant what He said, and that perhaps, after all, armed Europe will never suppress the aggressions of selfishness by the cannon and the sword, nor indeed in any other way than that which Christ has disclosed to us, by "doing good to those who hate us, and by praying for those who despitefully use us and persecute us," so overcoming evil by good.

But, thirdly, in whatever degree modern, social and industrial movements have contributed to dispel the mists of prejudice which cling to Christ's words, it is impossible to conceal from ourselves the selfish motives by which such movements are often disfigured and defeated. Do we not know forms of socialism which are little better than political materialism, prescribing the worship of gold as a god, turning the State into a providence, and taking the equal division of loaves and worldly advantages for salvation? Have we not recently seen these mean, secular aspirations too faithfully reflected in the savage threats and lawless violence of some who, in their eagerness to win a larger share of the products of labour (possibly in some cases their due), have not hesitated to infringe personal liberty and to imperil social order? Never does organised oppression wear so ugly a look as when it is practised by those who inscribe liberty and fraternity on their banner; and never does the contemptible cry, *Rem quocunque modo rem*, sound so forbiddingly as when it comes from the lips which have cursed so bitterly the unscrupulous greed of the employer. If these blind feelings after a juster and more loving order of human life are to escape their present perils, and to win real blessings for the poor and wretched, they must seek nobler motives, a higher point of view, and an ampler justification of their claims.

If God and Christ and the eternal world are to be ignored or denied, if man is to be the highest object of regard, if the best pleasures are held to be the pleasures of sense, and if the ultimate law of human life is to be gathered from the order of nature, then all the lofty theories of the socialist are baseless, and all his efforts are foredoomed to failure. For men are not born equal, but unequal in every quality of body and mind, the forces of nature do not favour the survival of the poor and feeble, but only of the fittest; and so long as men are incapable of prizing character above strength, and self-sacrifice above the pleasures of sense, all clamorous assertions of equality, and all State decrees for the equal payment of labour, will only end in the dismal and heart-breaking failure of M. Louis Blanc's State workshops. It is Christianity, and Christianity alone, which can at once justify, elevate, and direct the industrial efforts and inspirations of our time. If all are members of one great spiritual family, with one heavenly Father, one Saviour Brother, and one destiny of redemption from sin, then all are brethren and equal, then the laws of the lower natural order are seen to have no exclusive sway and currency in this high moral sphere, then money is of no value but to lighten labour, to give leisure for improvement, and to remove the hindrances to moral and spiritual development. Then violence will be

as impossible as oppression, and idleness as covetousness, for all will seek not their own, but another's wealth, and find the only true greatness and happiness in service. Strange as it sounds, it is profoundly true that we shall never succeed in our efforts to secure a juster distribution of wealth, until we come to feel that wealth in itself is of no intrinsic value. He alone could sell all that he has and give to the poor who has found his treasure in heaven. And, therefore, whether men see it or not, the only true law of life for our industrial future is that which has been formulated by Christ for all time, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you."

Here we have a formal statement of the *summum bonum* of man. Is it a true statement? No question at the present day presses more urgently for settlement. For how can we determine which of all the modern attempts at social reconstruction are possible and hopeful, worth thought and assistance, until we know the goal which we should endeavour to attain? We cannot be agnostic on this question in such an age as ours without the deadliest peril, for if we refuse to incur the trouble and responsibility of its consideration our senses will settle it for us, to the corruption and degradation of our life. What, then, is supremely good for us, what is the one thing needful? Is it the love of God, or the praise of man? Is it character or possessions? Is it what we are, or what we have? Is it the food of the senses, or the eternal life which is in Christ Jesus our Lord? We must gain a complete and final answer to that question, if we would rid our life of perplexity, vacillation, and disappointment. Do we believe, as our Divine Master taught us, that we are the children of an Omnipotent Fatherly Love, which is the source and basis alike of our life and the life of all creatures? Do we believe that to restore to us the broken communion with that love the Lord Jesus lived and died? Then, surely, we shall acknowledge that to live in the light of that love, to reflect its brightness, to feel its warmth, to share its impulses, and to do its work is the highest felicity whether of earth or heaven! To will as God wills is to be noble and happy. It is to have the rare power of finding in all outward things the occasion of lofty thought and feeling, to see the goodness of the Divine love in the impartial sun and rain, to behold its beauty in the hue of the lily, and the far shining of the sea, to realise the outgoings of its sympathy and pity in the innocence of the child and the patient faith of the sufferer, to recognise the touch of its redeeming discipline in the pain of remorse, the stirrings of compunction, and the birth-throes of better resolve. So to live is to win back again clearness of vision and readiness for self-sacrifice, to rise into a sphere so lofty that its clear air is never obscured by the mists of selfishness, to have a heart sensitive to every touch of Divine feeling, and an intellect which is the willing servant of the loftiest principles of truth. Then, if social troubles arose how prompt and easy would be their solution. Capitalists would ask, not how can we get as large a share as possible of the products of human toil and prudence, but how can we so moderate our just claim as to secure to our fellow-creatures the opportunity of a good and noble life? And labourers, on their part, with the same lofty conception of the true aim of existence, would consult, not how to wring the last possible farthing from the capitalist, but how so to frame their requirements as to conform to the necessities of trade, to the advance of the common interest, and to the progress of mutual confidence and love. All this may seem perhaps to some of you the merest Utopian dream. Call it what you please; still if it be accordant with the will and teaching of Christ I believe that it will one day be realised by redeemed men on this earth. For I believe in a true development as well of goodness as of truth. Nay, more, I see the signs of such a development in the course of Christian history and in the movements of our own time, and, above all, in that promise of our Divine Master, "Lo, I am with you all the days, even to the end of the age." If he be here, if His Spirit of love dwell in the heart of our struggling Christendom, I know that it must be pressing us forward in the direction marked out in the Divine counsel, and that in spite of human ignorance, sin, and opposition it will one day bring us to the appointed goal.

Do you ask me how long I think it will be ere the Spirit of God has thus taken of the things of Christ and made them blessed realities in the thought and life of the world? I cannot, of course, presume to answer such a question. I know how suddenly moral influences which have been slowly gathering force sometimes leap to their triumph. I know how in the history of the kingdom of God the darkest night has been sometimes broken by a supernatural sunrise of grace. In some such sudden movement and victory I expect that the world will see the fulfilment of Christ's promise of His return. But of course if we set aside, as we have no business to do, that Divine promise of help and demand of expectation, and if we construe the rate of moral progress in the future by that in the past we shall be constrained to admit that it may be slow and variable, continuing through long ages and generations, with many a halt, many a deviation—aye, and many a falling back. But even so, even in the most unfavourable event, is it nothing to believe in dark and chaotic times that we are moving after all under Divine guidance to a divinely determined goal? What of defeat is too shameful for endurance, or what of misfortune is too heart-breaking to be borne, if only we may hope that all things are working together, both effort and opposition, both faith and

unbelief, for the establishment of that kingdom of which Christ is the light and life?

I conclude by three short words of counsel which are naturally suggested by our subject.

First, it is necessary to advance in order to preserve what is of eternal value and significance in our teaching. At all times the human mind naturally strives to find a rational relation between the various particulars of its knowledge. It endeavours to bring them into a reasonable harmony, to include them within a single intelligible scheme. It follows, then, that in any given age the eternal verities of religion will be brought into rational relations with what in that age is looked upon as historical and scientific truth. When, however, as time goes on, doubt is thrown upon those historical and scientific conclusions, that doubt will be reflected on those eternal truths of religion which human reason has associated with them. Then a new need arises. We must carefully separate that which is certain and essential in our historical inheritance of religion from that which was merely accidental, which was only added to it to serve the needs of intellectual harmony.

The necessity for what I may call this "advance of separation" is specially great in our own time, because more than in almost any previous age what is merely human in our religious traditions and doctrines is being called in question. To save, then, what is eternally true, we must not hesitate to advance in the separation from it of what is accidental and already more or less discredited.

Secondly, while not hesitating to advance, we must be satisfied to advance slowly and prudently, so as not to overrun the will or capacity of those we seek to take with us. However true may be our principles, and however benevolent our aims, we shall fail if we reckon on moral capacity which does not exist, or on Christian knowledge which has not yet been realised. If we would raise men we must keep within reach of them, and count it a higher thing to bring the whole of Christendom one step nearer to Christ's ideal life in a decade than to dart forward to the end in thought and imagination in a moment. For the moral redemption of the race, then, insight is not more necessary than patience, that tender consideration of the true shepherd who restrains his own impatience that he may carry the lambs in his arms and gently lead those that are with young.

And, lastly, in all circumstances, whether our advance be slow and halting, or swift and hopeful, we must make ceaseless endeavours to reach the appointed goal. The way to it may be strait and hard, but at least it is plain and unmistakable, for it has been marked out for us by the pierced feet of Him Who waits to welcome us at the end. Many a time, no doubt, human pride, folly, or wilfulness will stray from it into the crooked paths of falsehood and selfishness, but not the less must we strive unceasingly to press back into the appointed path.

Our place is among our brethren, however far they may stray. We are to be their memory and their conscience, the living voice which ever cries in their midst, "This is the way, walk ye in it." And though sometimes the star of our hope may look dim and distant, may seem to our straining eyes to waver and flicker and almost disappear, we must still press onward with a faith which is stronger than sight and surer than reason. We have a sure ally in the divinely implanted instinct of human aspiration. For it is true, as one has nobly said, that "an eternal longing, an unwearied pressure, a beating of the labouring wings, however far the height and lone the track, mark the spiritual tendencies of Christendom." It is for us to appeal to this Divine witness and impulse, and in the days of doubt and danger, when foes are many and shadows are dark and hopes are low, to stay our souls upon that promise of Him to Whom all human power is weakness and all human wisdom foolishness. "As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to Me and every tongue shall confess to God."

AT Manchester Cathedral on Tuesday last, in the presence of the Bishop of the diocese and other dignitaries, Dr. Maclure, late vicar of Rochdale, was installed as Dean of Manchester, in succession to the late Dr. Oakley. The new vicar of Rochdale, the Rev. J. M. Wilson, late head-master of Clifton College, was sworn in as Archdeacon of Manchester, in succession to Archdeacon Anson, resigned.

THE funeral of Miss Mary Eleanor Benson, daughter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, took place at Addington on Wednesday.

TUESDAY'S *Gazette* contains an announcement by the Lord Chamberlain to the effect that the Queen has been pleased to command, on the recommendation of her Majesty's Chapel Royal Commission, that the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, shall be permanently closed.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1890.

"GENERAL" BOOTH'S PROPAGANDA.

II.

LAST week we referred to the religious aspect of "General" Booth's new crusade, and expressed the opinion that it did not harmonise with the precepts and example of the Master. We will now briefly view the scheme from the social standpoint. Herbert Spencer declares that "minds in which the conceptions of social actions are rudimentary are also minds ready to harbour wild hopes of benefits to be achieved by administrative agencies." This appears to fit the present case. "General" Booth does not take an Eiffel Tower observation of the great social problem of "vice, profaneness, and immorality," and their creative or operative action on poverty—a problem which has baffled wise men, from Solomon even until now. He rather views it merely from the height of a man, head and shoulders above his brethren, but who can see nothing of the chequered plan of campaign, because of his nearness to it. The people described by Herbert Spencer as having "rudimentary minds" are those who, when the question is asked, "Is there distress somewhere? suppose nothing more is required than to subscribe money for relieving it." And so, "General" Booth's scheme is doomed to failure, because it utterly ignores causes, and deals only with effects.

It is true there is, especially in London and the great cities, an enormous amount of squalid hopeless poverty. Philanthropy has endeavoured often enough to extend the hand of brotherhood to the outcasts constituting this unsound *stratum* of society. But it seems to increase with greater rapidity than ever, and more often comes into evidence in the form of street demonstrations. For this helpless, almost hopeless section of humanity, "General" Booth proposes the remedy of involuntary rescue. He has not apparently remembered that the prisons and workhouses are powerless as deterrents or incentives, and we merely continued the former because nations cannot afford to ignore collectively the elementary personal axiom older than the Christian era, "the wages of sin is death;" and the latter as a moral duty. In both the subject treated is submitted to personal restraint and this very restraint, though essential, defeats the re-creation of "the living soul" within the degraded mass of flesh, bones and blood. But "General" Booth assumes that he can allure into his "colonies" by the bait of breakfast and supper the very beings whom the prison cannot reform or the workhouse elevate! The colonisers are to engage upon the most sunless drudgery—they are, in fact, to "work out their own salvation" by processes which assume a steadfast purpose, and yet they are to be under a more despotic restraint than that of the workhouse. And what is the example continually set before the physical and mental vision of these converts to thrift and religion? Surely one at variance with the precepts "General" Booth persistently preaches! What is the very existence of the Salvation Army, as a paid force, but a social blot, a breach of the rudimentary rules of political economy? When a given number of men or women are physically supported at the expense of their community, there is rottenness somewhere. There is a clear reversal of the dictum, "If a man will not work neither shall he eat," and the community is impoverished and absolutely degraded. It is admitted that the great standing armies and enormous armaments of the Continent prevent the proper development of industrial life. And in degree the establishment of the Salvation Army as a paid force retards the progress and wealth of the non-militant members of that sect, who are called upon to keep in idleness a large number of stout labourers and domestic servants. It should be here parenthetically observed that the mere leg and lung exertion to which the officers of the Salvation Army are subjected is not work, however much it may fatigue, because it is as unproductive to the community as the convict's exercise on the treadmill. But what we wish to emphasise is that "General" Booth's precept to the outcasts whom he has induced or seduced into his colonies is that they must work to live, while the example continually placed before them is that there are stalwart men and strapping lasses by hundreds or thousands who live by singing and praying. If this scheme of social regeneration ever had a chance of success, that chance would be destroyed by the very means employed for its manipulation.

For the sake of the very class upon whom "General" Booth proposes to operate, it is to be hoped that "vaulting ambition will o'erleap itself."

Only harm to better-considered schemes can come of it, and at best the conversion will only be of the "prig" of the slums into the prig of society.

Reviews and Notices.

"LUX MUNDI," ETC. A Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Carr. Dublin: Charles & Son, 1890.

As an answer to the pretence that our Lord was an imperfect teacher, whilst He delivered all that we read in the Gospels, even till after His Resurrection, we do not think that this sermon is at all sufficient. It says that His increase in wisdom meant that He gradually recollected all His appearances in the Old Testament. (See Preface, p. 4.) *That* the friends of *Lux Mundi* would acknowledge. As to who wrote the various books of the Old Testament, it is of no consequence, unless Scripture asserts in such case who the author was. If there is any difference in the style or language, which can prove difference of date, let such be adduced. But, if Scripture is silent, that is of no importance. There is much that is true in this sermon; but it does not answer such Scripture, as being "made perfect through suffering" (Heb. ii. 10; v. 9); and again, "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered." We see no answer to the pretence that our Lord learned "practical morality," or that He was imperfect in knowledge, as long as He lived. We should have been told that His perfection through suffering meant His sufferings being completed, and that His learning obedience could only mean His practising it even to the death. One critic in the press says that the preacher teaches that our Lord's humanity pre-existed. But we do not see that His words necessarily imply *that*. There is a reference to the Eucharist, which we think suggestive, if not dangerous. At p. 3 of Preface we read, "The great purpose of the Eucharist is to unite us with Him, who is absolute perfection, the God-man, that we may lose ourselves in His Divine humanity (perfect God and perfect Man in one person)." Our Lord says nothing of this in "This is My Body"; neither does St. Paul, in "The bread, etc., is it not the κοινωνία of the Body of Christ?" Does uniting us with the God-man mean that "our bodies have actual contact with His Body"? If so, this contradicts the Prayer-book. Losing ourselves in His Divine humanity looks like the Hindoo idea of our being absorbed in the Deity. How, in the Eucharist, are we united to the God-man, and lost in His Divine humanity, perfect God and perfect Man, in one person? All Scripture says is that the bread communicates to us His Body, or the graces from His glorified Body. Of His Divinity it says naught, except that, as God, He is present. That His Body is present except by effects the Prayer-Book denies. That His Deity must be present wherever His Body is, we need not argue. First, because His Body is *not* present, as it is in heaven; and, secondly, because His Deity is everywhere present. This is a sad attempt to teach consubstantiation under the cloak of an answer to *Lux Mundi*.

What think ye of the Presence? What mean ye by the Real Presence? What do you adore in the Sacrament? These are the questions of the day, as they were when Bonner was opposed by Cranmer and Ridley. It is vain to try and crush them out, with "We never speak of such things!" The answers to these questions mark the line between Romaniser and loyal sons of the Church. But if Romanisers will come out of their shells, and propound their theory of a Real Presence, and of what is to be adored in the Eucharist, all we ask is that they should speak out plainly and distinctly, so that one may know what they hold and what they deny. It is very unsatisfactory to read an *obiter dictum* on the subject, hard to be understood, poked into a dark corner of a Preface to a sermon on a wholly different subject. This is not being "ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." An editor says, "not a word about the presence, as you love me;" and then, on the sly, he puts forth his own notions, in a way, which, if almost incomprehensible, are at least capable of a plain Romish interpretation. So fought not Athanasius against Arius. So fought not our reformers, with the stake before them.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CORRECTIONS AND COMMENTS.

SIR,—I do not mean to offer any general criticism on the paper in the PULPIT of the 25th inst., which its writer most truly calls "an unscientific view of Creation and the Fall," but I wish to point out two misapplications of Holy Scripture.

The first of these is that "God charges His angels with folly." These words occur in Scripture, and are often quoted as if they had the authority of the Holy Spirit, though they have no more of His authority than the words which St. Paul quotes to condemn, that "there is no resurrection of the dead." This saying about the angels has no authority except that of Job's "comforter," Eliphaz, who in the end proved so totally wrong about "earthly things"—the Divine government of this earthly world—that his judgment about "heavenly things" is utterly worthless.

The other misconception is that the elder brother of the prodigal represents the angels, and cannot represent any human character, because to no man could God say, "Son, thou art ever with Me." Our Lord never introduced the angels into parables of human life and trial, but if for any reason He had done so, He would not have ascribed to them the very unangelic faults of anger, jealousy, and sullenness. The elder brother represents the Pharisees, taken at their own valuation of themselves—men with whom righteousness was the habit of their lives; and the purpose of that part of the parable is to show what are the temptations of such a character, to warn such men lest their goodness become merely habitual and mechanical instead of vital.

In the PULPIT, Dr. Donaldson says to one who believes in the final "restoration of all things" (Acts iii. 21), "To be consistent, he should never speak against vice or error, but rather should take comfort in the thought that all will be right in the end. It matters not whether men believe or not—whether they are saved now or not; they will all be saved in the end."

Now, whatever was the belief of the great prophets of the Old Dispensation as to the unseen world, we know that they looked for a Messiah, who was to

"turn away ungodliness from Israel"; and we know that this hope supported them in the view of such an awful calamity as the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity in Babylon. But did the hope of an ultimate national restoration make them indifferent to the calamities in immediate prospect, and to the national sins by which those calamities were provoked? Neither does the faith in a future "restoration of all things" make us who look for it indifferent to the sins of mankind, and the sufferings which those sins must entail, whether in the present life or in that which is to come.

And, to use a more commonplace illustation, Dr. Donaldson no doubt looks forward to an eternity of happiness; but would this faith enable him to regard a prospect of five years of penal servitude as not worthy a thought? No more do we look on the consequences of sin with indifference, because we believe they will have an end.

We, like Dr. Donaldson, "are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation"; and we do not believe that He who "inhabiteth eternity" has put it out of His own power to work in eternity for the good of His sinful creatures.

Though not quite relevant, I must quote the following most extraordinary paragraph from Dr. Donaldson's letter:—

"A Church totally independent of the State is an absurd fiction, because no Church can exist as a corporate body if a violation of its doctrines be not visited with some kind of punishment; and the ultimate appeal in all cases of refractory ecclesiastics is to the civil power."

Did the Church of Corinth appeal to Gallio to deal with offenders against Christian law?

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, October 27th, 1890.

THE BISHOP OF MEATH'S SERMON.

SIR,—I have read with interest the sermon of the Bishop of Meath, which appeared in the PULPIT of the 4th ult., on the limits of Christ's knowledge. With the object which the Bishop had in view in writing the sermon I fully sympathise; it was, I humbly conceive, to state the "sound doctrine as to Christ's dual nature," but in pursuance of that object, I greatly fear, that he has given away rather much to the enemy. Thus, for instance, he says that "Christ shows that on points of natural philosophy He was not beyond the level of his age, inasmuch as He speaks as though salt could lose its savour, *which we know it cannot do.*" (The italics are mine.)

Now in reference to the possibility of salt losing its savour, an excellent commentator remarks: "That this is possible in the land of Judea, we have proof from Mr. Maundrell, who, describing the valley of salt, speaks thus: Along on one side of the valley, towards Gibal, there is a small precipice about two men's length; and in this you may see how the veins of it lie. I broke a piece of it, of which that part that was exposed to the rain, sun, and air, though it had the sparks and particles of salt, *yet it had perfectly lost its savour;* the inner part, which was connected to the rock, retained its savour, as I found by proof." See his travels, 5th edition, last page. I have no doubt that other so-called scientific objections against our Lord's teaching are equally groundless with this one, but inaccurate science on the part of the defenders of Christianity has given to its scientific assailants a terrible weapon of attack.

The Bishop again remarks that Christ "resigned every Divine prerogative that would have been inconsistent with his fully sharing all the limitations of human existence in itself;" which he explains by saying that, "He emptied himself of the knowledge of times and seasons, which, as mere God, He must have possessed."

By "prerogative" the Bishop means attribute, as is apparent by the latter part of the quotation; then to say that Christ "resigned" any of these would be to make the Divine nature defective in Him; which would contradict the second article, which speaks of "two *whole* and *perfect* natures." But Christ, as God, cannot give up any of his attributes; and to say that He can, and still remain God, is a palpable contradiction.

Christ emptied himself not of the Divine nature, nor any part of it, but of the "form of God," in order that He might take upon Him the "form of a servant." And the "form of God" is rather that visible glorious light in which He is said to dwell (1 Tim. vi. 16); by which he appeared in ancient times, which is sometimes called his "Similitude" (Num. xii. 8); and sometimes his "Shape" (John v. 37). This is supported by the fact that the word μορφή signifies a person's external shape or appearance, and not his nature.

Jesus appeared to his disciples in another μορφή (Mark xvi. 12); He was transfigured, μετεμορφώθη (Matt. xvii. 2). And the "form of a servant" evidently signifies the *appearance* and *demeanour* of a servant, and not the essence or nature of the person. It was this visible glory, which was generally accompanied with a great train of angels that Christ "resigned;" this was "the glory which He had with the Father before the world was;" and it is in this "Glory of the Father" that He will come again to judge the world. It was this that He "veiled in flesh" when He became incarnate. I wonder would the Bishop kindly tell us the portion of Scripture where our Lord "assures us that of the times and seasons He knows nothing"? I know one text where He said to His disciples, "It is not for *you* to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts i. 7). He said on another occasion, "Now I tell you *before* it come, that when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am He" (John xiii. 19). Here He states his prescience to be a proof of His divinity. Was Peter wrong when he said, "Lord thou knowest *all things*"? (John xxi. 17). Or the disciples when they said, "Now we are sure that Thou knowest *all things*, by *this* we believe that Thou camest forth from God" (John xvi. 30). If they were wrong, why did not Christ put them right? So considerable are our Lord's prophecies that Bishop Newton though it right to write a particular "Dissertation" on them. No proof is given of the statement that "the omniscience which belongs to the Second Person of the Trinity, taken by Himself, He laid aside when He took flesh in the Virgin's womb." "Taken by Himself" is non-theological language. It is "dividing the substance" of the Godhead. The "right Faith" concerning our Lord's incarnation is "that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man." "*Perfect God* and perfect Man," "Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead." "All things whatsoever (including omniscience) the Father hath are mine" (John xvi. 15). On which Bishop Pearson

remarks, "because in Him is the *same fulness of the Godhead*."

The fact that Christ became a "perfect" Saviour through suffering, so as to make "a full, *perfect*, and sufficient sacrifice," is no proof that there was any imperfection either in His human or Divine nature. But the matter is rather the other way; the perfection of His work arises from the perfection of His nature.

On the book of Jonah the Bishop remarks that "nothing whatever depends on the question whether it be a history or an apologue." Surely this is not sound exegesis. If the book be a fiction, while I believe it to be real history, I am not believing rightly; and if it be real history, while I believe it to be fictitious, I am not believing rightly, so that in either case it is not a matter of indifference. To relate a fictitious story, containing events that might naturally occur, and characters that might reasonably exist, and at the same time to give no hint in any way that the story is a fiction, is to make the impression that it is true, which is neither more nor less than telling a falsehood. There is not a single hint in the whole book, from beginning to end, that it is an apologue, fable or anything of that kind.

R. DONALDSON.

October 20th, 1890.

[In case the very able and accomplished Bishop has not time to answer, we can assure our correspondent that it is a fact that salt never loses its savour. The rain, however, does dissolve and wash it out of the earth, clay, and other substances with which it is mixed; as was doubtless the case in "the proof" he adduces from Mr. Maundrell's travels. "The sparks and particles of salt" that writer fancied he saw in the earth must have been crystals of other substances than common salt. There is a wide difference in the meanings of the words "prerogative" and "attribute," but our correspondent, unlike the Bishop, uses them as synonymous. It is in St. Mark xiii. 32, "That our Lord assures us that of the times and seasons He knows nothing."—ED.]

CLEARING THE ATMOSPHERE.

SIR,—It has been for a long time painful though instructive to my own mind, to observe that many of those who assert the truth of the fearful dogma that depravity and misery will be endless, adopt a tone of extreme acrimony, and even of malignity, and not unfrequently misrepresent the arguments and statements of their opponents. Such practices are very reprehensible in regard to political matters, as the love of truth and the love of country ought to be the swaying impulses. But they become absolutely scandalous when employed by those who profess to be teachers of religion. I long ago arrived at the conclusion that accuracy, calmness, and equity are indications of conscious strength, while the opposite practices may fairly be ascribed to a consciousness of weakness, either as to the cause defended, or the capacity of the defender.

I think the letter in the PULPIT of this date, with a vehement and bitter attack on myself, is a flagrant instance of the serious defects to which I am referring; and that I am entitled to make some comments in a temperate manner.

The expression I used "some of your contributors better qualified than myself," is not necessarily an acknowledgment that I have not sufficient qualifications for the object in question. I am a layman, and have had earnest religious convictions during all my life; and I have endeavoured to become acquainted with the views of serious minds. I did not ask any one to help me "to the belief of my own opinions." I simply desired that intelligent and fair-minded persons should assist in the elucidation of a topic of great importance. The rude expression "What an opinion the man must have of himself," is not justified. My sole aim was to show that I obtained my bright hope and belief from the perusal of the Bible, and from no other source.

I certainly believe in "the final restoration theory"; but the tendency of that belief is to stimulate me to earnest efforts to bring before my fellow men the wisdom, equity, and love of God, especially as manifested in the fact that "He gave His only begotten Son." I wish also to show them that sin is a fearful evil, always bringing disaster on those who practise it. No one is more convinced than I am that the elect are fellow workers, or workers together with God in the great Plan of Salvation. I believe there is a hell, that is, that there are severe penalties in a future life, "many stripes" and "few stripes." But I apply the declaration "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth," to all the intelligent creatures of God, on the strength of certain grand and comprehensive texts. I do not believe that fire, or any appliances, except the infinite resources of the scheme of Redemption can transform, purify, and soften created natures. But I repudiate the notion that those infinite resources are only exerted in this short life, the threshold of an immortal existence, and I deny that such a doctrine is taught in the Holy Scriptures.

I explicitly protest against the assertion that I "endeavour to bespatter with calumny the fair fame of the great and holy dead." In my first letter I quoted the testimony of Milman; in my second of Lecky, the author of "Primitive Universalism," Henry Ward Beecher, and Neander; in my third of Dr. Fisher, Dr. Edward Beecher, Dean Plumptre and Dr. Farrar. I also again referred to Milman, to a statement of Dr. Pusey, and one made in the Biographical Dictionary of Smith and Wace. There was nothing in any of them of a harsh nature, either as regards Augustin or any one else. My object is to show that the Augustinian theology was not adopted by the Church under circumstances in which freedom of discussion prevailed.

I oppose the Augustinian theology, in reference to the points referred to, because I have long believed that it is not in harmony with the teachings of the Sacred Volume, and that it has inflicted and still inflicts incalculable ills on the intellectual and emotional faculties, and thereby on the conduct of mankind.

J. B.

Canonbury, 25th October, 1890.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—Will Mr. Laurence kindly say what is the orthodox view of Baptismal Regeneration? We shall then be able to see whether I hold it or not. To make assertions, without any sort of proof, furthers no good object.

The question is not, whether grace is, or is not conferred at Baptism or in Confirmation; but what

he grace? Every religious act may be, and is to the faithful, a means of grace.

Mr. Laurence makes me say, although I have not said it, "He denies that there has been grace conferred, because the effects that it ought to produce are not patent." I do not, however, object to this, if by grace we are to understand, as I would understand, that the tendency of grace is to godliness. Then I shall ask, "How is it possible to have grace without manifesting its fruits?" "By their fruits ye shall know them."

When Mr. Laurence penned the words, "This appears to me to be walking by faith and not by sight," did he really mean what he says? Are not the fruits of faith visible in the character of the Christian. "The just shall walk by faith;" but his walk is a thing to be recognised.

Mr. Laurence objects to calling faith, reason, and instinct principles. They are principles nevertheless, principles of action. Principles are elements. I have not put them in the same category as he asserts, if by category he means that they are the same in kind. Faith is a much higher principle of action than reason.

"By which (reason) they apprehend Him." I must ask Mr. Laurence here for proof. This he must not evolve from his own consciousness. The problem is to show that men by reason can find out God.

"Faith is not a faculty in any sense; it is the exercise of the spiritual faculty, which itself is the highest part of reason." What then is a faculty? Hearing. What is hearing? A function of the body. Again, What is a faculty? Reason. What is reason? A function of the intellect. And again, What is a faculty? Faith. What is faith? A function of the spirit. A faculty is also a principle — that which underlies an action. Will Mr. Laurence either kindly show where the logic is faulty, or acknowledge that he has written (inadvertently) nonsense?

I cannot understand the operations of Mr. Laurence's mental vision, and so am utterly at a loss to know how he makes me say reason and faith are opposite. They are not opposite. Faith is as far above reason as reason is above instinct.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, October 25, 1890.

CURATES.

SIR,—I have read, with much interest, your article on the above subject, but must take exception to one passage—"As a natural consequence the episcopal permission to 'cashier' the curate was not forthcoming." The following details of a case, the facts of which are now public property, will prove conclusively that bishops do not always take the part of, and see justice done to, oppressed curates. A clergyman was a few years ago appointed in sole charge of a school-house and large district, with the consent, or, perhaps I might say, under the direction of the bishop, with the guaranteed income of £40 a year, and was induced to accept the post by the promise of a new church and a separate parish; after about three years of hard work he received in money and promises over £1,000 towards the proposed new church. The invalid vicar of the parish resigned, and a young man was appointed, it is believed, under the stipulation that the proposed arrangements should be carried out; for some months all went well, and fair promises were made, and, alas, soon broken. A new bishop was appointed "who knew not Joseph," and the vicar went to the bishop with his story (which no outsider knows), and the bishop gave consent to a six months' notice being served. The members of his congregation, who were much attached to their minister, sent a memorial to the bishop, signed by 2,700 persons, and a deputation was appointed to wait on the bishop. But his lordship was uninfluenced by the memorial, and refused to receive the deputation. The only reason assigned by the vicar for conduct as harsh to the curate as it was to the congregation was, that the curate wanted a division of the parish which he, the vicar, did not, and that, being "only a curate" (these are the very words), he had no right to place in the hands of trustees the sum of £550, though he and his friends had collected it. It need only be added that the clergyman is now out of regular employment.

Cases of this kind cry loudly for a remedy. The unbeneficed clergy have difficulties to meet which few are aware of, and many of them have hardships to bear which are dispiriting to them and injurious to their work. This question is of burning importance to the very life of the Church. Would you, therefore, kindly open your columns, and invite correspondence on this urgent subject?

ECCLESIA.

TIME.

O, Time! Thou rulest with a power supreme,
O'er all the universe of mortal things;
Of life and death Thou know'st the secret springs;
The hidden future Thou dost make Thy theme,
And o'er the past dost hang a curtain'd dream.
Ere Saturn round his globe first placed his rings,
Or, ere the Sun first rose with outspread wings,
Thou saw'st, o'er chaos dawn, sweet light's first gleam,
Thou heard'st the song the morning stars first sung,
When, glory-lit, out-roll'd the countless spheres,
As new-wrought jewels from Creation's mine;
Thou wert, when circling ages all were young—
And down through all the myriad hungering years,
Thou art—until eternal morn shall shine.

JOHN W. KAYE.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bailey, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, West Cowes; Rural Dean of the Isle of Wight.

Baines, Rev. T. H., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Dalton-in-Furness; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Carlisle.

Bevan, Rev. Thomas Davies, M.A., Vicar of Ewenny, Bridgend.

Birbeck, Rev. B., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Bristol; Rector of Magor-cum-Redwick, Monmouthshire.

Bush, Rev. H. W., B.A., Chaplain of Bengal (Lahore).

Cree, Rev. W., M.A., Curate of Kirkby Lonsdale; Rector of Newton Reigney, near Penrith.

Denton, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Ashby-de-la-Zouch; Honorary Canon in Peterborough Cathedral.

Despard, Rev. A. V., B.A., Chaplain of Gothenburg.

Dugmore, Rev. E. E., M.A., Prebendary of Gillingham Major in Salisbury Cathedral.

Favell, Rev. Henry Arnold, M.A., Incumbent of St. Mark's, Sheffield; Canon of Wistow in York Minster.

Francis, Rev. David H., Vicar of Great Bentley, Colchester ; Vicar of Chaddesley-Corbett, Kidderminster.
Hawkesford, Rev. J. B., Vicar of Charsfield ; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Norwich.
Hawksley, Rev. W. C., M.A., Vicar of North Ormesby ; Vicar of All Saints', Portsea.
Hawley, Rev. William, Vicar of Kirk Michael ; Rural Dean of Peel, Isle of Man.
King, Rev. H. T., M.A., Curate of St. Thomas's, Winchester ; Vicar of Wanborough, near Swindon.
Kissack, Rev. Edward W., B.A., Rector of Kirk Bride ; Rector of Ballaugh, Isle of Man.
Lach-Szyrma, Rev. W. S., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Newlyn, Penzance ; Vicar of Barkingside, Essex.
Lloyd, Rev. John Augustus, M.A., Vicar of Broad Hinton ; Vicar of Mere, Wilts.
Mason, Rev. H. A.. Vicar of All Saints', Mile-end New Town; Vicar of Thundridge, Ware.
Mitchell, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Prescott ; Secretary of the Liverpool Diocesan Church Building and Extension Society.
Moulder, Rev. T. J., Rector of St. Swithin's, Demerara ; Canon of St. George's Cathedral, Demarara, British Guiana.
Napleton, Rev. J., Chaplain of St. Servan.
Nevill, Rev. R. W., M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester ; Vicar of Hook-with-Warsash, Hants.
Nicholl. Rev. Stephen Henry Fox, M.A., Rector of Llandough, near Cowbridge ; Rural Dean of Gronsath Lower Deanery.
Perkins, Rev. T. W., M.A., Vicar of Barkingside, Essex ; Vicar of St. Peter's, Newlyn, Penzance.
Salt, Rev. W. J., M.A., Cheltenham College Missioner for South London.
Scobell, Rev. E. C., M.A., Rural Dean of Gloucester.
Shaw, Rev. W. Frank, B.D., Vicar of Eastry ; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Huddersfield.
Sketchly, Rev. H. P., M.A., Curate of Bradford Peverell ; Sole Charge of Orcheston St. Mary, Wilts.
Smith, Rev. George, Chaplain to the Forces, Woolwich ; Chaplain to the Forces, Royal Victoria Hospital, Netley.
Smyth, Rev. Thomas Cartwright, D.D., late Vicar of Far Headingley ; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Ripon.
Squire, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Vicar of Long Grove, Herefordshire.
Staite, Rev. George Herbert, B.A., Chaplain of the Cottage Homes, Fazakerley, Liverpool.
Thurston, Rev. G., M.A., Curate of Broughton, near Kettering ; Vicar of Welford, Northants.
Westcott, Rev. Henry, M.A., Assistant Curate of Ryton-on-Tyne.
Westropp, Rev. Charles John, B.A., Rector of Little Yeldham, Essex.
Wheeler, Rev. George D. C., M.A., Rector of Barcheston, Warwickshire.
Whelan, Rev. W. J. F., B.D., Curate of St. Peter's, Ipswich ; Incumbent of St. Laurence's, Ipswich.
Williams, Rev. Frank Ricardo, M.A., Vicar of Combe Down, Bath.
Wilton, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Londesborough ; Canon of Givendale in York Minster.
Wolkenberg, Rev. Marcus, Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Woods, Rev. F. H., B.D., Warburton Lecturer at Lincoln's-inn.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Champernowne, Rev. Richard, Rector of Dartington, Totnes, at Plymouth, on the 22nd ult., aged 73.
Marriott, Rev. Fitzherbert Adams, Vicar of Chaddesley Corbett, Worcestershire, and formerly Archdeacon of Tasmania, at the Close, Exeter, on the 19th ult., in his 80th year.
Michell, Rev. T. Hungerford, of Bagshot, Hungerford, on the 24th ult., aged 63.
Pinder, Rev. George, late of Bournemouth, and formerly Vicar of Harford, at Leamington, on the 19th ult.
Raymond-Barker, Rev. Frederick Mills, M.A., Oxon., at 11, Montpellier-crescent, Brighton, on the 25th ult., aged 75.
Thatcher, Rev. Frederick, at Bakewell, on the 19th ult., aged 76.
Woodman, Rev. J. B., at Glanvilles Wootton Rectory, near Sherborne, on the 25th ult., aged 39.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness' Electropathetic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible ; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE PROMISE OF LIFE IN CHRIST JESUS.

By the Rev. GEORGE JANNINGS, M.A., Rector of Warmsworth, Doncaster.

Sermon Preached at Margaretting, Ingatestone, Essex, on Sunday, September 7th, 1890.

"The promise of life which is in Christ Jesus."—2 Tim. i. 1.

NO one can have read the New Testament with any degree of care without perceiving that new life for man is one great subject-matter of the revelation contained therein, and that we owe this blessed hope of everlasting life to Christ, and to His work of love on our behalf.

This great subject was a frequent topic of our Lord's discourse with His disciples, and He speaks of it in such a way as to show that we owe it all to *Him*, that it comes to us through believing in Him and being united to Him through a new birth by the grace and power of His spirit. Thus He says, "He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life." "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "I am the way, the truth, and the *life*." "I am the resurrection and the life." His remonstrance to the Jews was this: "Ye will not come unto *Me* that ye might have *life*."

The Apostles, after they were illuminated by the Holy Ghost, used similar language. They spoke of the Gospel message which they had to deliver as a revelation of life. Even as they were taught by the angel, through whose instrumentality Peter and some other of the Apostles were liberated from prison. The angel said to them, "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words (not of this doctrine or this Gospel, but all the words) of this *life*." Accordingly, St. Peter says in his second Epistle, that God by His Divine power hath given us all things that pertain unto "*life* and godliness." St. Paul speaks of eternal *life* as being the *gift* of God through Christ." And St. John says, "That the record which God has caused to be written for our instruction and salvation is that God hath given to us eternal *life*, and that this life is in His Son." He says also, "That this is the promise which God has promised us, even eternal *life*;" and in St. Paul, his second Epistle to Timothy, the last that he ever wrote—written not long before his martyrdom—speaks, in the very first words of it, of the subject of which his own heart was full of "the promise of *life* which is in Christ Jesus."

Now this is a view of religion and the Gospel which has a much more prominent place in the pages of the New Testament than it generally has in the minds of those who profess their belief in Christianity.

For what in point of fact is the Christianity of a large number of those who profess and call themselves Christians. To say nothing of the many who never join their Christian brethren in any sort of common worship, from one year's end to another; who live entirely without God in the world, without ever calling upon him in prayer, without ever reading or coming to hear his word. To say nothing of such as these, who, of course, are "dead in trespasses and sins," do not many, even of those who have some sense of religion and some fear of God before their eyes, look upon Christianity more as a religion to be professed, than as a life to be lived? It is looked upon by many as consisting of certain external acts of duty and observance, rather than as being part and parcel of our very life and being.

This is everywhere the representation of Christianity which is given us in the New Testament, viz., that it is a life to be lived, to be begun here on earth and perfected in the world beyond the grave. And judging from the way in which the life of a Christian is spoken of by St. Paul, and by the sacred writers generally, as being dependent on Christ as being derived from our union and connection with Him, and as belonging only to those who believe in Him, it would almost seem as if they made no account of the natural deathlessness — the inherent immortality of the human soul. The reason of this probably is, that mere continued existence, apart from the knowledge and love of God in Christ, is not accounted by them to be worthy of the name of *life* at all. This same Apostle says of one who lives only for the pleasures of sense and of the world that "she is dead while she liveth," and it is manifest that the question as to whether life is desirable or not depends entirely upon the sort of life we lead. We often say of life spent here on earth, under very unfavourable circumstances, that it is mere existence or that such a life is not worth living.

Now we may be sure that when God makes a promise of *life*, it amounts to something more than a mere promise of continued existence of endless being. The life of which our Lord Jesus speaks so much, the life which comes to us through believing in Him, is a life which it is happiness to live and which in the nature of things, can never come to an end, any more than the life of Jesus Himself can come to an end. Did He not say to His disciples, "Because I live ye shall live also." Christ has taken our human nature upon Him and immortalized it. If the soul of man be, by its very nature, immortal, there is no such thing as

inherent deathlessness in the human *body*. On the contrary, it is essentially corruptible and subject to decay. The fact that it is so is probably one of the bitter consequences of sin, and but for man's transgression might never have been. But Jesus has redeemed and ransomed our *whole* being. He not only quickens with new spiritual life the *souls* of those who believe in Him, He has promised to raise up their *bodies* also at the last day; and the Apostle St. Paul says, "If the spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal *bodies* by His spirit that dwelleth in you." So that the promise of life, which is in Christ Jesus, is a promise not only of an endless, but of a *glorious* life, for both body and soul."

This is our chief, our only consolation, when we commit to the dust the worn out and emaciated bodily frame of some dear relative or friend. We have just laid in its last resting-place the mortal remains of one who had suffered much and long—out of respect to whose memory this large gathering is assembled here to-day. He was to me of course a stranger, even as I am a stranger to all of you; but there is a bond of union which, whether we worship under form of this Church order or that, unites us all in one body, and that bond of union is faith in a common Saviour, in Him "Who hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light." We hope and trust thus that faith was the support of our departed brother * under his affliction, and that he has now entered into the higher life of the spirit and into the rest which remaineth for the people of God. Indeed, I feel sure that this is his happy lot, not only from the testimony to his character which has just been borne by one of his brother Foresters at the grave side, but by the testimony of one who knew him personally, and who told me less than an hour ago that he died a very happy death.

What a comforting thought is this for the dear ones whom he has left behind! What a consolation to them to reflect that their loss is his gain, and that he has now entered upon that life which is life indeed!

Yes, the spiritual life in Christ of which the Apostle speaks in the text, and of which the New Testament is so full, is not a mere endless existence, bestowed upon us as a reward for believing in Christ. It is the life of Christ Himself. It begins with a true knowledge of God as a reconciled Father in Him. As Jesus Himself said, "This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." It is a life which is sustained by spiritual communion with God through faith and through the use of the means of grace, and it will be perfected hereafter when "this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality."

Neither is there anything mystical or transcendental about this spiritual life—anything, I mean, which would make it impossible for ordinary people to live it, amid the business and cares and pleasures of the world. It simply consists in believing that what Jesus says about Himself and about the blessedness of believing in Him is actually true. It is simply trying, in our poor way, to pay the debt of gratitude which we owe to Him, for what He has done and suffered for us, by trying in our daily lives to follow the blessed steps of His most holy life—by doing kind and unselfish actions, not thinking overmuch of what we do, nor fancying that we are laying up a store of personal merit, by denying ourselves for His sake; but just doing what we think *He* would wish us to do, because we desire to please Him, and to grow more like Him.

His was the *grand* life which gives us the true idea of life. It was a life spent in doing good; in living for others. It was a life of (1) devotion, of (2) unworldliness, of (3) self-sacrifice. And He was in everything an example to us. In taking upon Himself our human nature, He took it altogether, and was not exempt from our innocent human weaknesses. What an example of devotion He sets us.

As Man, He felt the need of communion with God in prayer. We read of Him, in one place, that "in the morning rising up a great while before day, He went out and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed"; and on the important occasion of choosing the twelve Apostles, we are told that He spent the whole of the previous night in prayer to God. In fact, His whole life here on earth was one continued act of devotion. "He always did those things which pleased the Father." As He said, "I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me." And although He mingled freely with all sorts of people, and did not hold Himself aloof from the society of those who were despised by the religious party of His day, He lived entirely above the world, and set no value on anything which this world had to offer. His, too, was a life of self-sacrifice—a life spent in doing good, in living for others, for the sick, the sorrowful, the sinful. And as He lived, so He died for others—died for us, "The Just for the unjust, that He might bring us unto God."

These salient points in the character of the perfect Man are among the chief marks of the spiritual life—of the life which is in Christ Jesus.

But observe, first, that this spiritual life is "*in* Christ Jesus." It springs from our union with Him. We do not work it in ourselves by following the example which He has set us. *We* do not *make* this union; it was made for us. It

* Arthur James Algar, whose burial took place immediately before the service.

was pledged to us in the Sacrament of Baptism; it is typified and cemented in the Sacrament of Holy Communion, so that the timid and diffident and self-reproachful soul, who is conscious of much sin and infirmity and has not power to realize and the courage to accept and appropriate the spiritual blessings which are so freely offered, has not cause to say, "Oh, this union with Christ is such a high attainment, I must grow very greatly in grace, and become much more holy than I am at present, before I can venture to think that I am in real union with Christ." No, this is trying to begin at the wrong end. It is not our holiness which brings about our union with Christ. It is rather union with Christ which *makes us* holy. We look to ourselves, when we ought to look to Him. We depend upon ourselves, when we ought to depend more entirely on Him. Spiritual life is not our attainment. It is the gift, the "promise of God, which is in Christ Jesus."

And some of the chief signs that we are spiritually alive are, as I have said, 1, first, a spirit of devotion. There can be no true spiritual life without devotion—without a realizing sense of God's being and presence with us always. The feeling of the devout mind is well expressed by the Psalmist, when he said, "Thou art about my bed and about my path, and spiest out all my ways." And together with this sense of the reality of God's existence, of His power over us, and of His love towards us, there will be an earnest desire to know more of God, and to draw nearer to Him, a desire which finds appropriate utterance in these words of David: "As the hart desireth the water-brooks, so longeth my soul after thee, O God." The devout mind is not satisfied with the mere outward form of religion, with merely saying prayers, and coming to the place where God is worshipped. Its worship is no mere lip-service, but a real outpouring of the heart. Its cry is that of the saint of old: "Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul."

Let none be discouraged, if this goes rather beyond their present experience. If there is any desire for better things—any sincere endeavour to be more fervent in prayer, to be more real, and to have done with all make-believe and pretence, he will not quench the smoking flax, he will rather fan it into a flame.

2. To the soul, again, which is spiritually alive, the invisible world is as great a reality as the visible. It looks not so much at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen—remembering that the things which are seen are temporal, whilst the things which are not seen are eternal; but yet it is not like the hypocrites of a sad countenance, nor does it look with cynical scorn upon the innocent pleasures of life. It uses with a cheerful gladness God's bountiful gifts; uses the things of this world, so as not to abuse them, or, as it might better be rendered, so as not to use them to the full—not making *them* its chief good, remembering that the fashion of this world passeth away.

3. In addition to this devotion towards God, and this unworldliness of mind, those who have life in Christ, will manifest a spirit of thoughtfulness for others. They will have some degree, at least, of the mind which was in Christ Jesus, and will "look not only on their own things, but also on the things of others." It must be for most persons in a very humble way, in a very small sphere, for the most part, within the precincts of home—by showing tenderness and unselfishness towards the members of our own family circle. This circumscribed sphere may afford scope for self-sacrifice of the noblest and most Christ-like kind.

A minister of Christ, in one of our large towns, tells a story, which is a touching example of the highest form of self-sacrifice. "A young woman," he says, "once came to me in great trouble, and told me that her father was drunk two or three times a week, that he insisted on having a large part of her earnings to spend in drink, and that when he came home at night, the worse for liquor, he often beat her. Life was becoming intolerable to her, and she wanted to know whether it would be right for her to leave him. Her mother was dead; her father, if she left him, would be alone. Was it her duty to stay? I told her that, in my judgment, his treatment of her had released her from the *obligation;* but I asked her whether it would be possible for her to be happy at night if she went elsewhere, whether she would not be always thinking that in his drunken fits her father might come to harm, and whether she could not regard the care of this unhappy man, with all the suffering and misery which is brought upon her, as the special service to which Christ had appointed her? She looked up, hesitated a moment, and then said, 'I *will*.' She would not have made a good model for an artist painting a saint. Her dress was not picturesque, but the unlovely dress of a poor working girl. Yet her *conduct* was lovely, and was a true imitation of the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ. She came to me," says the narrator of this story, "three months later, and told me, with the light of joy on her face, that her father had never once come home drunk since that night when she had resolved to care for him for Christ's sake."

We may none of us be called to such a deed of self-sacrifice as that, but if only we are willing to act on the same principle—that of sacrificing self for others, and to do the little that we can, we shall receive a like reward.

In trying to show kindness and to do good to others for Christ's sake, we shall be blessed ourselves. Our own spiritual life will be strengthened and deepened, and we shall be Christians, not in name only, but in deed and in truth.

THE CHURCH: ITS CHARACTER, PRIVILEGES, AND OBLIGATIONS.

By the Rev. WILLIAM COWAN, M.A., Incumbent of St. Augustine's Church, Londonderry.

Sermon preached at St. Augustine's on Sunday, November 10th, 1889.*

"I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord. Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem. Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together: whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord. For there are set thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David. Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be within thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God I will seek thy good."—Psalm cxxii.

AFTER an introduction dealing with the local colouring and teaching of the Psalm with regard to Judaism and the Temple worship, the preacher went on to say:—All this is typical of the Church of God, a great palace of plenty, built of living stones compacted together in holy love and spiritual communion; Catholic, Apostolic and One, whose specific mission in the world is to witness for faith in God, for the redeeming work of Christ, and for the grace and power of the Holy Ghost. It is described in one of the Articles as "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ," and it is a witness of all truth, and of the means of spiritual life in the world. Jerusalem said of old, as it were, "Here is the temple in which God reveals Himself, and where men ought to worship, where truth is proclaimed, and peace may be found." The Church says to men in effect, "There is truth to be believed; here it is, in these creeds, prayers, anthems, hymns." The true object of faith is affirmed, and the vagrant faculty of faith finds a centre or resting-place. No Church can long hold its influence over the reason and affections of men unless it speaks to that within them which reasons —the understanding—and holds up before that within them which loves—the heart—a worthy and commanding object. There may be much eloquence, learning, pathos, earnestness, on the part of the ministers of the Church, but their power is transient and their usefulness trifling, unless behind them and beside them there is a Person to be believed and a Law to be obeyed. A Church in whose palaces Gospel plenteousness abounds must be a teaching Church, with something which we call "the Faith" to be taught, "the Faith once for all delivered unto the saints." And this Church Catholic, of which we claim to be a branch, rejoices to-day in its precious heritage of the Christian year and the ancient creeds. One after another, in the stately procession of its feasts and fasts, it wheels into view the grand and central facts of the life and work of Christ, which it is the office of His Church to declare, to illustrate, and to enforce. That Church comes nearest to the New Testament ideal and pattern, in which the circle of faith, with Christ as the centre from which truth radiates on every side, is preserved intact and unbroken. Any Church which does not set forth Christ in its creeds as the great object of faith and love fails in the purpose of its existence. It is disloyal to God. There is death under its shadow, as under the shadow of the Upas-tree. Now this is the grand distinction of our own Church. Read her Creeds, her Liturgies, her Articles, her Hymns, and is not Christ in them all? You see His beauty shining upon you, you feel the strong arms of His grace around you, you hear the tender tones of His love speaking to you.

"Him first, Him last, Him midst, and without end,"

you see in every service, breathing upon them all the breath of life. Ah, yes, nowhere is Christ set before you so worthily, so fully, and so true to life, in His righteousness, in His Divinity, in the fair beauty of His person, in the invincible power of His Spirit as in the Creeds and Liturgies and Hymns of our Church. There is a mediæval story of a great artist who wanted to paint a picture of Jesus Christ: he did not believe in Him, except as a pure and noble man who had once lived, but he wished to paint the Jesus who was so dear and precious to multitudes of men and women, so he began to learn all he could of the man he wished to paint. He talked to the followers of Jesus, he entered into the spirit of the Church's teaching about Christ, he studied the Gospels that he might know all that was possible of the character that he wished to show through the lineaments of his portrait. His study was thorough, and earnest, and conscientious, and before his canvas was ready for the colours, he had given himself to be the obedient servant of Jesus Christ, and had prostrated himself before the Being whose human form he had desired to paint, crying in the words of the old Apostle, "My Lord and my God!" A Church to be true and to be useful must present Christ, so that men seeing Him can say, "My Lord and my God!"

The Psalm suggests another thought in relation to the Church. In the Church Catholic and Apostolic there is ample provision made for the soul's yearning to worship, and to declare its homage. Jewish ritual and sacrifice and Temple have passed away, but there are other forms and ceremonial observances which have taken their place, other ritual and sacrifices which are helps to devotion and instruments of grace. There are prayers, and hymns, and sacraments, and Bibles. There is the font, the holy table, the Church-going

* Preached at a time of much local controversy arising out of the Lord Bishop of Derry's sermon at the Cardiff Church Congress.

bell, the Lord's Day itself, the organ, with which a softer and holier music is sounding in

"The upright heart and pure."

These are all forms, and all may be made conducive, and have been made conducive, to the building-up, the strengthening and the quickening of the spiritual life. There are those indeed who cavil at all outward forms, and disown in religion the value of what is external and tangible and visible. But why should they do this? The forms we use are simply the outward expressions of the inward feeling or the inward belief. To be consistent, such persons would have love without a spoken word, and friendship without the pressure of the hand, and patriotism without its historic symbols and monuments, and the heroism of arms without the heroism of the soldier. The rejection of forms would banish out of life the ministry of art and the graces of architecture, and the elevating influences of music, and regard man as a disembodied spirit, and religion in the midst of a material universe without material expression. Shall we live in a world of sense all the week—a world of lavish splendour, and in homes of prodigal expenditure, or, at all events, in houses of as much beauty and comfort as we can give them, and starve our senses when we strive to worship God? Has not God given us our senses, and they, as well as our hearts, must find in our Churches and in our religious services that which will minister to their needs. Otherwise, a part of our nature will be left religiously unsatisfied. Let us be assured that a God who has given us Bibles and Sacraments and Churches knows better what is good for man, and what he needs, than they who talk against the externals of religion and the forms of worship. Do not despise forms, but do not rest in them. Make them, as you may, helps, not hindrances, to devotion. Let them all brighten and warm and strengthen your spiritual graces, as the sun and the light and the winds of heaven give colouring and fragrance and health to the plants and flowers of your garden.

There is another thought which this beautiful Psalm suggests. A Church, in whose palaces plenteousness abounds, must be a working Church, for out of faith must come worship, and out of faith and worship must come faithful service. A true Church will not only call men to serve Christ, but will point out channels in which to do it, and account no concern of humanity, no care, or labour, or sorrow of man remote from its interest or foreign to its sympathy. It will despair of no wretchedness, turn away from no fallen one, and forget no need. The Church embraces in its loving arms all mankind, and brings them to the feet of Christ, that He may put His hands upon them and bless them. That is why we labour for the heathen; that is the explanation of our Orphan societies, our Hospitals, our Sunday-schools, our Girls' Friendly societies, our societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals—all these and many others rest on a basis of Christian faith, and are the expression of the Church's services to God and to man. There never was a time in which there was more need for the Church to put forth her strength and her energy in works of faith and labours of love. She is at this moment on her trial. There is an unusual activity abroad in the world to undermine Christ's Church. Uncertainty and unbelief are all about us. Indifference is destroying many souls. Worldliness is eating like a cancer into the religious life of many. Scepticism is everywhere—in philosophy, in science, nay, in the Church itself. The spirit of the time scoffs at creeds and all doctrinal foundations, and floats, if I may so say, upon a sea of doubt. And because this is so, man is sad and unhappy. The cry of the unbelieving world, the wail of the believer who has lost his faith, must ever be, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." And, therefore, if we can give the doubting soul to-day, the worldly man, the careless, the scoffer, the sorrowing, a sight of Jesus in His loveliness, we scatter their doubts, and overcome their selfishness, and give them "beauty for ashes, and the oil of joy for mourning." There is an old Irish legend, to the effect that an enchanted spring, once the joy of the people, had been buried under a mighty slab of stone; over it a great palace was built, to shut out every ray of light, and so to hide it for ever from the people for whom it worked joy and comfort; but never has it been forgotten, and sometime there shall come a discoverer who shall move or pierce the stone, and, letting in a ray of light, give the fountain freedom to spring up and again bless mankind. In every human heart, however bad, there is a deep-sealed fountain of faith covered over and concealed by the hard granite of worldliness, indifference, or scepticism. Happy is he who, finding this fountain, can pierce the hard rock which overlays it, and let in a ray of the glorious illumination of Jesus Christ to the waters, which will rise to meet it, and dance and bubble as of old. This is the duty and the privilege of all of us who know the truth, and have realised for ourselves the blessedness of Christ's salvation. We are bound to lead others to Jesus. As members of His Church, washed in His blood, and elect by His Spirit, it is our duty to make Him known to those who now know Him not. In this way we deepen our own spiritual life, and build up and strengthen our Church. And so we realise amongst ourselves the peace and prosperity of our Zion. And it is only by acting upon the principles set forth in this Psalm that we can become a strong Church and a prosperous Church. We must have the faith of Christ, we must love God's house and ordinances, and worship Him in spirit and in truth, and we must be diligent in Christian service and abundant in good works. The Church that sees farthest into the truth of

God, that believes the Gospel with a calm strong faith, and is true to the ideal of the New Testament, by wearing righteousness as a garment, and holiness "as a robe and diadem," that Church will grow, will strengthen her stakes and lengthen her cords. Her walls shall be called Salvation, and her gates Praise. An ignorant Church cannot be "the light of the world." An impure Church is too feeble to contend for the faith; a worldly Church cannot teach self-denial, and a Church without the virtues of religion has no right to speak of morality. But a holy, spiritual Church is embodied power, the spirit of Christianity incarnate, the light of heaven in a dark world. Of her it shall be said, "This and that man was born in her, and the Highest Himself shall establish her." Yes, that is the really strong Church, not the Church which can boast of large numbers, of great wealth, or even of sound doctrine, but the Church which possesses the fulness of spiritual life, the Church which exercises the best and holiest influence upon the lives of its members. That Church is strong whose children live pure and godly lives—lives of self-denial and self-forgetfulness, of meekness and humility, of peace and charity, and withal lives of courage and zeal and fortitude and patient continuance in well-being. All things else apart from this holy, useful, and Christlike life, are but "vanity and vexation of spirit." And whatever differences may exist amongst the members of Christ's Church, with regard to questions of doctrine and ritual, that life may be lived by them all. The sea may be disturbed and agitated on the surface, but there is calm below. And though we sometimes see on the faces of Christ's soldiers the foul spray of controversy, if we could look within we should see "the light that never was on land or sea," and "the peace of God that passeth all understanding." While you pay little heed to the controversy, be sure that you possess "the light," and that you are not destitute of "the peace." Let your efforts be used to strengthen your spiritual life, to promote peace and charity amongst your neighbours, to do good to all men, and, in every legitimate way, to advance the kingdom of Christ around you—that kingdom "which is righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Pray for the peace of Jerusalem. Pray for the prosperity of our Church. So shall our own spirits be at rest amid the superficial strife of tongues, and in the heart of the darkest circumstance we shall find a heaven of purest joy. Peace shall be within our walls, and prosperity within our palaces. The beauty of the Lord our God shall be upon us. He will establish the work of our hands, and make us a blessing and a praise in this city!

THE Dean of Durham, who is now at Bath, has so far recovered as to be able to leave his bed.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1890.

THE NEW PURITANISM.

ON two previous occasions we have discussed the religious and social aspects of the latest move of "General" Booth. During the past week Archdeacon Farrar has pronounced in favour of "Dear General Booth's" scheme, and declared his intention of preaching in Westminster Abbey in support thereof. By the time these lines are printed the sermon will have been delivered, and we shall take occasion to comment upon it next week. What we now desire to say is that Archdeacon Farrar has undertaken a very grave responsibility indeed in giving the sanction of the Church—so far as an eminent member thereof can commit the Church one and indivisible—to the religiously-revolutionary programme of the chief of the Salvation Army. The watchword of battles, which have culminated in the overthrow of all freedom, has often been "civil and religious liberty," and the most rebellious objections to constituted authority have been raised "for conscience sake," the possessors of the "conscience" forgetting the apostolic injunction: "conscience, I say, not thine own but of the other." It seems to us that the new Puritanism which is becoming blatant enough around us, will soon grow into a tyranny. It is true that the iconoclastic spirit can scarce proceed in these latter days to the destruction of the "storied windows richly dight" of, to all true Englishmen, the fane of fanes. But something has happened, some daring and, it seems to us, unskilful hand has been drawn across the "plan of salvation," when an illogical, undigested scheme for making the world happy by machinery, can be solemnly approved in that place of all places in this kingdom, the very stones of which laugh at history.

Some four hundred years ago Jack Cade pro-

posed, or at least some three hundred years ago Shakespeare supposed that he proposed, to regenerate humanity and settle the problem of inequality of birth and circumstances that then disturbed this sparsely populated kingdom: "I thank you, good people; there shall be no money; all shall eat and drink on my score; and I will apparel them all in one livery; that they may agree like brothers, and *worship me their lord.*" Some two hundred and fifty years ago Oliver Cromwell, masterful man that he was, acted on the same principle if he did not speak the same words. And Puritanism was elevated to the position of judge and ruler. There were Bishops and curates who acquiesced, who admitted the "great administrative genius" of the Lord Protector, and worshipped the rising sun. And the Puritan who in persecution had been, sour and unpleasant though he was, a model of scrupulosity, grew more and more aggressive in his bilious piety, until the body politic discharged him as the body physical discharges gall-stones. But he might have been the death of all true religion, and rampant atheism might have taken the place of humble reverent belief. The milestones of Time have fled by as the onward journey has been pursued, and now the passengers by History's coach see enacted a drama which is, unconscious as the players may be, a plagiarism in the weaker modern style of the blatant, all-pervading Puritanism of the seventeenth century.

Of what is Archdeacon Farrar thinking? Has the world been waiting for a self-constituted saviour? Has the "Life of Christ" no other lesson than that the world should groan for a militant prophet, to whom alone can be entrusted the task of making straight the crooked paths? Are the mountebank accessories of drums and tambourines essential to the spread of Christian truth? Is it essential that girls should lose the modest bearing which is the charm of feminine humanity, and become unfitted for all duties but those of a sanctimonious gipsydom? That every tent-maker should imagine himself a Paul, and give up tent-making? And is the picture of the "Preacher," which Cowper drew, now out of fashion?—

> —— simple, grave, sincere;
> In doctrine uncorrupt; in language plain,
> And plain in manner; decent, solemn, chaste,
> And natural in gesture; affectionate in look
> And tender in address, as well becomes
> A messenger of grace to guilty men.

What is the cause of this topsy-turveydom, and where will it lead? Surely, Archdeacon Farrar has mistaken his vocation when he has become the fugleman of "General" Booth! Surely he was carried away by some wave of irresponsibility when he wrote that letter, proposing to give £50 "next year," and preach in Westminster Abbey! It was the advent of the Holy Ghost that set fire to the Pentecostal sacrifice, not a subscription list.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." November, 1890. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Much the best paper in this month's *Expositor* is Mr. Peyton's on "Our Lord's Second Temptation." In the main, he follows Dr. Edersheim, who shows that this temptation was to yield to Jewish nationa prejudices, and to the national desire for "signs.' Mr. Peyton ably shows the seductiveness of the temptation, looked at from this point of view.

The Dean of Peterborough—to continue for the present a title which we are glad to see will be exchanged for a higher — continues his "Notes on Genesis," but this month there is nothing very striking in them.

Mr. Hutton concludes his "Personal Reminiscences of Cardinal Newman." He says: "He (Cardinal Newman) was very free in his readiness to give his blessing to or to say Mass for Protestants. Old-fashioned Catholics must sometimes have been startled by this, as it was like casting before swine the great privilege of the faithful. True, I have heard the question discussed as a *dubium theologicum*, whether a priest can say Mass for the recovery of a Protestant farmer's cow—the question is a practical one in some parts of France—when the farmer is willing to pay the accustomed *honorarium;* and the affirmative reply is, I think, only allowed when the "intention of the Mass is kept strictly private." We extract this sentence exactly as it stands, but we make no comments, for the beginning of commentary thereon might indeed be like the letting out of water; we might fill four or five whole numbers of the Pulpit, and that would be inconvenient. The paper on "The Language and Metre of Ecclesiasticus," we cannot criticise; something of Hebrew we do know, but Sanskrit and Syriac are beyond us.

Like Mr. Horton, we much enjoyed Dr. Stalker's *Imago Christi*, and thought it, as he does, a very suggestive book. Professor J. A. Beet's paper on "Future Punishment" reviews modern opinions; he criticises them courteously, and refrains from saying that some of them might be advantageously expressed with more modesty.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

Sir,—I take it as a playful expression of Mr. Heber Evans that he calls me a literary will-o'-the-wisp, tempting him out of his beaten track. It is a pleasantry which sparkles on the surface of severe studies. But is he so sure that his own studies are so solid that they do not, like the quagmire, naturally produce that phosphorescent light? Let us see.

Some weeks ago he was at pains to defend Dr. Hobart from my imputations of defectiveness, one-sidedness, and general untrustworthiness. Of course the charge is a grave one, but I did not speak without reason. Your correspondent will remember that I substantiated that of defectiveness by instances at the time. Mr. Heber Evans, from a source of know

ledge best known to himself, pooh-poohed my assertions; he claimed that the book of the learned Doctor was "certainly to be accepted as perfectly trustworthy." I did not myself accept it at the time as the wise dictum of a second Daniel come to judgment, and I waited till I saw my opportunity in the further development of his criticism on the Doctor's book. It was with pleasure, therefore, that I noticed in your issue of September 27th, that Mr. Heber Evans began to suspect what I had long ago found out, that Dr. Hobart was misleading him, and in this wise. When claiming that Aretæus makes a similar division of diseases, as St. Luke vii. 21 into *νόσοι* and *μαστῖγες*, Dr. Hobart "gives no quotation in support of this statement, and he does not say that Aretæus uses these particular words, *νόσος* and *μάστιξ*." Exactly so. The Doctor made an untrustworthy assertion and could not support it. Mr. Heber Evans at last suspects him. Now, if instead of being a steady Greek Testament luminary, he had been a roving will-o'-the-wisp like me, he would have spotted at once the misrepresentation and exposed it. He would have told your readers that *νόσος*, *morbus*, is the common term for all diseases; that Aretæus does not divide diseases into *νόσοι* and *μαστῖγες* at all, but that he does treat of a limited number of diseases under the two heads of *morbi acuti* and *morbi diuturni*; that *μάστιξ*, of disease, is not medical at all; that if any division is made, it is that by Galen, *de locis affectis*, I. 3, where *νόσος* is, *pro hâc vice*, distinguished into *νόσημα*, a chronic change of the part diseased, and *πάθος*, an injury from external causes; finally that Hippocrates, *de morbis*, makes no classification at all. Dr. Hobart is here distinctly untrustworthy.

Further, St. Luke is only enumerating the ills that Christ cured the people of. Among these is *πνεύματα πονηρά*. Now Dr. Hobart winks at the fact that Greek medicals knew nothing of what the New Testament calls demoniacal possession, but Aretæus having once only suggested the possibility that epilepsy was called "sacred," because of the opinion that a *δαίμων* entered into the man, although Dr. Hobart knew that *δαίμων* among the Greeks does not at all correspond to the Jewish devil, yet on the strength of that one bare suggestion he talks absurdly (p. 20) of "a complete revolution being effected in medical science, since the days of Hippocrates, who repudiated the idea that epilepsy, *ἡ ἱερὴ νόσος*, was more supernatural than another. The assertion is perfectly ridiculous as regards the old Greek medical writers, and can only find countenance in mediæval times. I refer to it in order to make clear the point that Dr. Hobart's book is unreliable.

But if any doubt lingers in anyone's mind, the consideration of the word *θηρίον* (a diminutive of *θήρ*, animal) will dispel it. Mr. Heber Evans repeats with amusing gravity, as if it were pure gospel, the statement of Dr. Hobart, that "St. Luke uses this word here exactly in the same way as the medical writers who employed it to denote venomous serpents, etc." Oh! Dr. Hobart, is that the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? Are you not cleverly concealing the real facts of the case under this Simon Pure mask? Out with the truth! No more *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi* for your guileless readers.

Now the quotations of Dr. Hobart, p. 51, are right enough. But that is only one side of the medal. What do we find on the other? Why what the Doctor must know very well, and for which I can give chapter and verse, that medical writers used *θηρίον* in very different senses as well: Galen, of the brute creation, and equivalent to *τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα*, and in divers places of the lion, bear, bull, horse, dog, goat, etc.; Aretæus, of game, such as hare and wild goat, providing suitable food for invalids; inferentially of such animals as like to have their ears tickled, as dogs, cats, horses, and repeatedly of the elephant, *ἐλέφας τὸ θηρίον* being found more than once; Dioscorides, of bees, wasps, centipedes, gnats, intestinal worms, etc. Hippocrates, of the animals in Asia Minor, which surpass those of Europe in variety and shape.

Now it is beyond a peradventure that medicals used the word *θηρίον* exactly as unprofessional writers, sometimes of poisonous reptiles, sometimes of other animals. St. Luke does just the same. It is a case of Trojan and Tyrian. *Nullo discrimine agetur.* This is therefore a flagrant case of *suppressio veri.* Dr. Hobart is convicted of untrustworthiness.

The word *χρώς* in Mr. Heber Evans' last letter catches my eye. He follows Dr. Hobart in his statement that, from Hippocrates to Galen, the word *χρώς* in medical language meant the body and not the skin. I demur to this statement, it does not square with my reading. But as the skin is part of the body, it is important to give clear evidence of the doctor's misstatement. I turn to Dioscorides *de fac. parab*, I. 108, where his subject is remedies for skin diseases. Well, he writes *σμήχει δὲ χρῶτα ὀπὸς συκῆς*, which the translator renders into Latin: *cutem extergit ficulneus liquor.* Clearly he takes *χρῶτα* to mean "skin" and not "body." That the translator is correct appears from the previous § 107, still on the same subject of skin diseases, where Dioscorides uses *ὅλου τοῦ σώματος* for the whole body. In the next § 109 *χρώς* is again translated by *cutis*, skin. Again Galen *def. med.* 295, says of *λέπρα* (not leprosy in our sense of the word, but a skin disorder) *λέπρα ἐστὶ μεταβολὴ τοῦ χρωτός*, *λέπρα* is a change of the skin contrary to nature, with roughness, irritation and pain; at times even scales fall off, and at times it attacks more parts of the body (*ἐπινέμεται πλείονα μέρη τοῦ σώματος*). Here, again, *χρωτὸς* can only mean "of the skin." In another place Galen speaks of the skin of the mouth, *χρὼς τοῦ σώματος*, where "body" is out of the question. I have other references, but these will suffice for my purpose, which is to show that Dr. Hobart has been seriously misleading the guileless. Perhaps Mr. Heber Evans will be less confiding for the future in the "perfect trustworthiness" of his authority. Perhaps even the day will come when he will hand him over my light-hearted nickname of will-o'-the-wisp!

One or two other points in Mr. Heber Evans' letter remain to be noticed. He represented St. Luke at first as a Jew, saturated with the language of the LXX., and now, to meet a cogent argument of mine against the use of the classics, he claims for him a knowledge of them, Winer notwithstanding, and maintains that "the writer of the Third Gospel was not ignorant of the most famous Greek authors." He adduces no proof of this statement, for no proof exists. It is purely an *ignis fatuus* and nothing more. It is brought forward to meet my argument respecting a quotation from Plato in particular, but it seems to me to land its author on the horns of a dilemma. For if Mr. Heber Evans claims that St. Luke was so well educated, so widely travelled and so well read in classical literature, as he represents him, what possible objection can he have to his real opponents, Drs. Salmon, Plummer and their followers, going just one little step further, viz., including Hippocrates and other medical writings

then extant in his studies, and calling them professional. Why halt at the medical books? There is no wall of partition, "no half-way house," as Sir George Trevelyan said of a modern problem, still unsolved. Philo Judæus read them, Plutarch read them, probably Josephus. Then why not the classically-read St. Luke? No, it is really not worth fighting for. Mr. Heber Evans must either withdraw those arguments and that assertion of his which trench on the classics, or he must yield to his opponents the main question in dispute. I see no other alternative.

F. T. P.

October 25th, 1890.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—Kindly permit a few words in reply to Mr. Murphy's last letter in the PULPIT of the 18th inst. Mr. Sandlands had said that "it is impossible to make a greater distinction than the one that exists between the teaching of the Church of England and that of the Church of Rome regarding the mean of salvation so far as man is concerned; the former holding it to be by faith, the latter asserting it to be by works." Mr. Murphy says this is a "misconception;" which is the same as saying that the two doctrines are identical so far that both are necessary to salvation, which means, of course, that both are true. That this is Mr. Murphy's meaning is evident from what he says in the next sentence in support of his charge of "misconception," that "justification by faith and justification by works" are *both* taught in the New Testament. It is very plain, when he wrote thus, that he did not understand the difference between Popish works and St. James' works, and that he himself was labouring under a misconception when he charged Mr. Sandlands with one. There is very often a vagueness about Mr. Murphy's language, which when rendered precise, and its logical sequences pressed home on his attention, he immediately cries out "I did not say that." But this won't absolve him from the implications of his language.

In the conclusion of my last letter on this subject I used the word "impropriety" to avoid employing a harsher term. Mr. Murphy had not the sense to see this; but, to make my meaning clearer, I will now state that it is *false* to say that "justification by faith is never taught in immediate connection with judgment." And, in support of this, I will quote St. Peter (1 ep. i. 7), "That the trial of your *faith*, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto *praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ*" How did Mr. Murphy overlook *this* "statement of fact"? I see no difficulty in St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, nor in St. James' doctrines of justification by works, nor in the mode of reconciling the two, and hence cannot "entertain any fear as to the consequences of letting men's minds come into immediate contact with the difficulties of Holy Scripture," but what I do dislike to see is quasi-theologians attempting to ventilate theories which are repugnant to common sense, and subversive of the first principles of Divine Revelation.

R. DONALDSON.

October 27th, 1890.

SIR,—I am not going to arbitrate upon the views of Mr. Vernon, Mr. Sandlands, and other gentlemen about the Grace of Confirmation. Time enough to settle this question when we have found out how to obtain candidates whose minds are wholly free from ignorant and most erroneous ideas with regard to Confirmation.

1. Every clergyman knows that one of the most heart-aching periods in his annual round of ministry is the period before and after Confirmation. The minds of most of our candidates are undoubtedly saturated with erroneous views. They think that Confirmation is something *done to them*, and which must be done at a certain age or thereabouts. They regard it as something to be done on or soon after their arrival at manhood or womanhood—in fact (and the truth must be spoken), arrival at puberty. A farmer expressed himself thus to a clerical friend of mine—"I won't have my daughter confirmed. I don't want her to be made a woman of yet." Now, experience in many parts of England compels me to the belief that this statement fairly represents the crass ignorance, the densely benighted misapprehension which prevails on the subject of Confirmation. Mr. Vernon and Mr. Sandlands, and other giants in pastoral knowledge and experience, may talk as beautifully as they can write, but I challenge them to produce a clear image of Confirmation—man's part or God's part—on minds so fearfully deluded. You cannot produce a clear portrait on a blurred glass, or an imperfect sheet of paper. And I shall be grateful to your esteemed correspondents if they will tell me how to exorcise the low, debased, degrading notions which prevail amongst all classes, but especially, and more emphatically, amongst the least educated. For instance, how will they get behind the mind and thought of some young woman who is asked, "What do you understand by Confirmation"? "Taking my sins upon myself." "What sins"? "The carnal desires of the flesh." These answers, and similar thereto, have often been given to me. Such crass ignorance may be due, in a great measure, to ignorant teaching by ignorant parents. But this only removes the difficulty one step back. How did parents get their ignorant views? If we go backward and backward we get no nearer to an answer. And then the question would arise—"What! have all the instructions given to many generations of candidates had no effect in dissipating dense, dark, erroneous views; and will the candidates of to-day be, after all our instruction, teachers hereafter of equally wrong views"? I fear it will be so, for the ignorance is unfortunately due, in some measure, to language used by our Church. She always uses the passive tense—"to be confirmed." This undoubtedly conveys to the minds of most people the idea of something done *to* the candidate; and it is inevitable that the words, "until he come of age to take it upon himself," should be brought in. "Come of age." "*Of age.*" What is the natural meaning to give to these words? Not the age of wisdom or *years of discretion*, but the physical age, the manhood or womanhood, at which the candidate *knows* that he has arrived. Yes, here on the apparent authority of the Church herself comes in the debasing idea alluded to before. And *it* is not thought of as the whole Baptismal promise, but only one small portion of it. I need not particularise again. I believe I have accurately described an actual and prevalent state of misapprehension. What remedy for such a state of things. We teach our candidates correct views. We talk seriously to them, but we have not ascertained their views. We have not exorcised what is faulty.

We treat their minds as if they were a *tabula rasa.* And with what result? Infinitely little. The correct ideas are speedily forgotten. The vile weeds of ignorance and misapprehension grow up again. Is there not a cause?

2. A, B, C, tell me they *were* confirmed in such and such a year! "Indeed," I say, "how do you know you *were* confirmed? By their fruits ye shall know them. I have not seen you at church, nor at Holy Communion. If you *were* confirmed, *i.e.*, strengthened with God's Holy Spirit to do your duty to God and man, you would be giving some evidence of your Confirmation. But according to outward appearance you are not walking in the will and commandments of God. The Bishop could not confirm you. He has no power to confer the Holy Ghost or give you any special gift. He can only pray with and for you, laying his hands on you after the example of the holy Apostles. Your life and conduct wholly belie the idea of your having been confirmed. You presented yourself for Confirmation. You made a solemn promise with your lips. But it was all a form—a hollow form. And the last state is worse than the first. For better it is not to vow than to vow and not to pay."

3. To my mind it is a grievous falsehood to speak of all candidates as *having been confirmed.* I fear it is too true that a large proportion have received no Confirmation in a proper sense of the word. They think that something has been done *to* them. At a particular age they have made themselves answerable for their sins, and their minds do not grasp any idea of the *Grace of Confirmation.* To them it is only a certain thing to be done, or form to go through—one they were told to go through—at a particular age. And I want to know how Mr. Vernon and Mr. Sandlands would exorcise the hydra-headed ignorance that prevails in regard of what Confirmation is and does . . . and how they would show that the language of our Church in its use of the passive tense is not in a great measure answerable for this ignorance.

There is much more to be said about Confirmation. But enough for to-day. The rest can wait.

A CLERGYMAN FOR FORTY YEARS.

SIR,—I try to answer Mr. Sandlands' questions without merely making assertions, without mere appeals to my own consciousness, without talking nonsense inadvertently or otherwise, and without meaning contrary to what I say. My opinions, which I believe to be orthodox, concerning the Grace of Baptism, are given in a paper published in the PULPIT of 3rd May, 1884, a copy of which I have sent Mr. Sandlands. My opinions concerning reason are as nearly as possible those of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, whose philosophy gained large acceptance even during his own life, and has been superseded, so far as I know, by no other philosophy except the materialism that is current now, which I do not regard as real, but as pseudo, philosophy.

Baptismal Grace I believe to be given in answer to prayer. Prayer is not always answered in the way, or at the time, that those who offer it expect. Mr. Sandlands says that the tendency of grace is to godliness, which is quite true and unanswerable. But the very meaning of *tendency* is, that the operation of *that which is tending* is gradual, and that the resulting manifestation may be slow, and not visible at any defined moment.

If Mr. Sandlands insists on calling everything by the name of a *principle*, I cannot oblige him to desist from so doing, however erroneous I may regard the loose use of terms. He says he did not place the principles, instinct, reason, and faith, in the same category; but he does so now, by describing them as principles of action. Admitting this (which however I do not) it does not follow that faith is a higher principle of action than reason. Faith is a higher or lower principle or ground of action according as that towards which the faith is directed is a venerable or a degraded object. Faith in Juggernaut is not a high principle of action.

I am asked for proof that it is through reason that men apprehend God. I refer to Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection." The problem is not, as Mr. Sandlands thinks, to show that men can find out God by reason, but to show that men's reason apprehends Him when He reveals Himself. Indeed, the Coleridgian philosophy is particularly clear on the point, that it is by revelation only that men can have even a conception of God.

I am asked to show where "the logic is faulty." I suppose Mr. Sandlands means his own logic; he ought to say what he means. If he calls the ten or dozen lines that precede this question *logic*, I have to say as follows. It may be logic, but it is not very logical to ask a question (what is a faculty?) which requires for answer a definition, and gives no definition, but examples. Mr. Sandlands says hearing is a function of the body. I would say that it is a function of the living body. He says that reason is a function of the intellect. But the lower animals have intellect or understanding, while they have not reason. Even were it said that reason is a function of the human intellect, I have to say to this, that understanding and reason are distinct faculties and powers, one of which is not part of the other. *Vide* again Coleridge. Mr. Sandlands says that faith is a function of the spirit. I think it is an act, or in another aspect a condition, of the spirit; or it may be a condition not of the spirit, but of the mind. I cannot regard it as a function or mere power. A faculty, your correspondent says, is *also* "a principle—that which underlies an action." I suppose this means that a faculty is both a faculty and a principle of actlon. If this be correct, the sense of hearing is not a faculty, for it is certainly not a principle of action.

Mr. Sandlands is at a loss to know why I attribute to him that he has said that reason and faith are opposite. I refer him to his words in his letter in the PULPIT of the 6th September:—"I can explain to myself how it is possible for reason to be the guiding principle in all that he (Cardinal Newman) has done, and I may be pardoned for saying that the principle of true faith would have led him in a very different way." This appears to me to imply that reason led Newman one way, while faith would have led him in a different way, so treating reason and faith as opposites. If I misunderstand the paragraphs cited, I beg to submit that it is not I who should be blamed.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

November 3rd, 1890.

THE BLACK RUBRIC AGAIN.

SIR,—If "C. C., V.-G." writes any more on the Black Rubric I fear your readers will get black in the face. Surely we have had enough of it.

A CONSTANT READER.

ATONEMENT TO CANON LIDDON'S MEMORY.

SIR,—Allow me, pray, to correct a mistake made, through my own bad writing, in a quotation from the late Canon's sermon.

A sentence ran thus: "We cannot get nearer the truth than by saying that these elements, remaining in their very natural substances, *we get* veiled channels," etc. This sentence is ungrammatical, though its meaning may perhaps be seen. But "we get" should be "are yet."

C. C., V.-G.

THE BISHOP OF MEATH'S SERMON.

SIR,—I quite enter into the spirit of Mr. Donaldson's letter in your last impression. There is something to my mind painful and profane in any one standing up in the presence of the Saviour and Judge of the world, and saying that He did not know what some of His creatures do. If the subject were not so serious, it would be mere trifling. It may be chemically true that the salt, as such, does not lose the essential property by which salt is salt, though the various authorities do not appear to be unanimous on this point. Still in a country where salt was in common use, especially for sprinkling on the floor and threshold—very much as sea-sand is in our Eastern Counties—a proverb would naturally arise among the people as to the uselessness of salt that had been exposed to weather and wet and soil, and our Lord used frequently the proverbs and household words of the people around Him. It might be with equal absurdity advanced that the illustration which follows might be objected to. "Neither do they light a torch and put it under a bushel," because scientists know and everyone for the matter of that, that the light would go out for want of oxygen. Moreover, let it be noted that our blessed Lord does not say that salt does lose its savour; He supposes the case, and does not assert it, any more than He asserts that a torch, from which the air is excluded, will continue burning. Surely our Lord knew the effect produced by an extinguisher, and yet if we read into the parable that the light went out, which would be the actual fact, the point of the parable is lost, for the lesson does not concern the putting out of the light, but the concealing of it. The two illustrations stand on precisely the same footing. When will men exercise common sense in common things, and have respect at least for, if they withhold reverence from, the Lord our Saviour.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.
Vicar of Dulverton and
November 3rd, 1890 Prebendary of Wells.

P.S.—Would it not be well to make a really critical investigation into the "make perfect" of Heb. ii. 10? To the English ear this rendering of both our versions seems to suggest previous imperfection. This is not found in the original, which is one word and not two, τελειῶσαι, and surely means that the Lord reached the climax of His consecrated priestly work through the path of sufferings. In the Syriac and the Vulgate the original is represented by one word, and that a verb; the former has the verb *Gemar*, and the latter *consummare;* neither does "He learned obedience" imply the opposite previously. He learned "the obedience," that is, His submission to the Father's will, "Thy will, not mine be done" from His sufferings, as He learned and experienced the Father's love and power when "He was heard, so as to be delivered from His fear"—εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT, M.P., has, in his capacity of President of the Municipal Corporations Associations, taken charge of the memorial to the Government originated by the Church of England Burial and Funeral Reform Association. This memorial, which asks for the concentration in the Local Government Board of the authority over burial places now divided between that Board and the Home Office, has been signed by nearly all the dignitaries of the Church, and by the most eminent members of the medical profession. The active support of the Municipal Corporations Association, containing representatives of all the Municipalities, cannot fail to be of great additional weight.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bell, Rev. William Charles, Vicar of Northmore, Oxon.
Biscoe, Rev. Henry Treweeke, M.A., Chaplain of King's College, Cambridge; Rector of Great Greenford, Middlesex.
Bond, Rev. John, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln and Vicar of Steeple Ashton, Wilts; Rural Dean of Bradford Portion of the Potterne Deanery.
Brown, Rev. T. Kenworthy, M.A., Rector of Brockhall; Rural Dean of Weedon.
Burrows, Rev. C. L., M.A., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of St. Paul's, Bournemouth.
Crump, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Smethwick; Rural Dean of Handsworth.
Davies, Rev. E. T., M.A., Rector of Aberdovey, Merionethshire; Rector of Pwllheli, Carnarvonshire.
Dreaper, Rev. R. Walter S., Assistant Curate of St. Barnabas, Bell-street.
Dun, Rev. James, Vicar of Higham Ferrers; Rural Dean of Higham Ferrers, First Deanery.
Edwards, Rev. R., Senior Curate of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead; Curate-in-Charge of the New Welsh Church, St. Winefred's, Birkenhead.
Ewing, Rev. Canon, LL.D., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Killaloe; Chaplain of Christ Church, Luzern.
Eyre, Rev. John R., M.A., Vicar of St. Helen's and Hon. Canon of Liverpool; Rector of St. Peter's, Tiverton.
Faithfull, Rev. W. J. H., Curate of Slaugham, Sussex; Rector of Oaksey, Wilts.
Gifford, Rev. Henry George, B.A., Rector of Rackenford, Devonshire.
Gray, Rev. George Holmes, M.A., Minor Canon of Canterbury Cathedral; Vicar of Stodmarsh, Kent.
Gwyn, Rev. P. P., M.A., Rector of Brandon Parva; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Deanery of Hingham, Norwich.
Hardey, Rev. Montague, M.A., Curate of St. John the Baptist, Margate; Priest-Vicar of Lichfield Cathedral.

Harry, Rev. Ifan Ll., Vicar of Coldhurst; Chaplain to the Oldham Workhouse.
Hickling, Rev. Edmund Lovegrove, M.A., Rector of Frostenden, Suffolk.
Hodgson, Rev. A. Taylor, B.A., Rector of Coston-with-Runfall; Rector of Old Catton, near Norwich.
Hood, Rev. E. P., Curate of St. George's Cathedral, Perth.
Hough, Rev. William Woodcock, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Corpus Christi College Mission Room (Christ Church, Camberwell).
Johnson, Rev. H. B., Rector of Welborne, Norfolk; Rector of Orchardleigh-cum-Lullington, Somersetshire.
Kendall, Rev. John Francis, B.A., Vicar of Little Tew, Oxon.
Laurence, Rev. H., Curate of Christ Church, Hornsey.
Nethercott, Rev. H., Curate of St. Thomas's, Portland-place.
Newbolt, Rev. William Charles Edmund, M.A., Principal of Ely Theological College, and Honorary Canon of Ely Cathedral; Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Nichol, Rev. J. G. S., Rector of Litchfield; Rector of Ampthill, Bedfordshire.
Parish, Rev. W. O., M.A., Vicar of Longfleet, Dorset; Honorary Chaplain to the 8th Battery 1st Dorsetshire Artillery Volunteers.
Ravenhill, Rev. William Henry, Rector of Sutcombe, Devonshire.
Remington, Rev. Reginald, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Barlings, near Wragby.
Rigg, Rev. G., East London Clergyman.
Rorison, Rev. Vincent, Lewis, M.A., Provost of St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth; Dean of the Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dumblane.
Sharp. Rev. Cato Ensor, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Wellington College Mission Room (St. Peter's, Walworth).
Steele, Rev. Otho W., M.A., Vicar of Wolstanton; Rural Dean of Newcastle-under-Lyme.
Thompson, Rev. John, Incumbent of Rosslyn Chapel, and Acting-Chaplain to the Troops at Glencorse; Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Rosslyn.
Thrupp, Rev. R. W., M.A., Vicar of Alderminster, Worcestershire.
Tottenham, Rev. Edward, Vicar of Madingley; Rector of Coveney, near Ely.
Tyacke, Rev. Richard Trezise, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Wilmot, Rev. J. J. T., M.A., Rector of Ampthill; Rector of Litchfield, Hants.
Wilson, Rev. J. C. M., East London Clergyman.
Wilson, Ven. J. M., M.A., Vicar of Rochdale and Archdeacon of Manchester; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester.
Woodhouse, Rev. J. S., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Woods, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Curate of Leyton, Essex; Vicar of Christ Church, Somers Town.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brewer, Rev. William John, M.A., at Farningham Vicarage, on the 26th ult., aged 76.
Cox, Rev. John Edmund, D.D., F.S.A., late Vicar of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, on the 27th ult., aged 78.
Day, Rev. Arthur Benjamin, at Lawn Cottage, Fishponds, near Bristol, on the 30th ult., aged 61.
Dayman, Rev. Edward Arthur, at Shillingstone Rectory, Dorset, on the 30th ult., aged 83.
Finlay, Rev. John, A.M., Incumbent of Balleek, Dio. Armagh, at Ballymoyer Parsonage, Co. Armagh, on the 30th ult., aged 72.
Gattie, Rev. Edward Alexander, M.A., at Bolingbroke House, Wandsworth Common, on the 1st inst., aged 91.
Hughes, Rev. Evan, Vicar of North Sunderland, at 6, Edith-road, West Kensington, London, on the 27th ult.
Lear, Rev. William, M.A., Priest-in-Charge of St. Anne's, Buxton, at Rye, on the 22nd ult., aged 41.
Molineux, Rev. Thomas, late Rector of Waberthwaite, at Rock Farm, Isfield, on the 19th ult., aged 70.
Newman, Rev. William, M.A., at Wasborough Vicarage, Barnsley, on the 30th ult., aged 33.
Raven, Rev. Wodehouse, for forty-nine years Vicar of Christ Church, Streatham, at the Vicarage, on the 31st ult., aged 83.
Townsend, Rev. T. J. M., forty-four years Vicar of Searby-cum-Owmby, at Dancsgate, Lincoln, on the 31st ult., aged 71.
Whitaker, Rev. George Henry, M.A., for fifty-six years Rector of Garforth, on the 2nd inst., aged 81.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE LATE CANON LIDDON.

By the Rev. Dr. BRIGHT, Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church, on Sunday, September 21st, 1890.

"Then thought I to understand this, but it was too hard for me, until I went into the sanctuary of God. . . . . It is good for me to hold me fast by God, to put my trust in the Lord God."—Psalm lxxiii. 16, 17, 28.

WHETHER faith be actually shaken, or whether it be only obscured, let the Psalmist's remedy be tried, but on a sufficiently large scale: "Until I went into the sanctuary of God." How often will it help the troubled soul to do this quite literally! The worship of the Church of Christ is of itself a witness for Him. It brings us into full contact with the solidity and the majesty of religion; it lifts us up into a serene and radiant atmosphere; it sets in motion a sympathetic force which can suspend the power of individual misgivings; it takes us out of ourselves, and reminds us of the Divine facts which are intended to furnish an external ground of belief, independent of our own changeful feelings, and thereby to supply a most real and urgent need. But the Psalmist's phrase has other applications: we do not find our God merely in church. We also enter into His sanctuary whenever we exercise that faculty of the spirit which recognises Him as its true Father, as the source of our interior personal life. We enter into His sanctuary whenever we consciously lay ourselves open to those spiritual influences which are thus akin to the deepest elements of our being. We enter into His sanctuary whenever we thus advance from the conviction of our own spiritual personality to the thought of a God, living and moral, Who is its source, from Whom a further revelation was distinctly to be expected, and Who has, according to the creed of Christendom, bestowed this boon in the person of Jesus Christ. We enter into His sanctuary when in the strength of that sovereign conviction, if distinctly called upon to do it, we examine and confront the objections made against our faith. We enter into His sanctuary whenever we give weight to the testimony borne by the vast and beautiful world of Christian goodness, by those pious lives and peaceful deaths which could not, we must feel, be dependent on a mere illusion; by those "greater" works of Christ in the renewal of human character and the transformation of human life, of which His outward healings wrought on the blind, the lame, the deaf, the lepers, the very dead, were as shadows cast before. We enter into the very Holy of Holies when we "look away from all else to Jesus," and study that life which is the most persuasive of all evidences, and when, with eyes fixed on it, we earnestly try so to think and wish to speak and act as we believe that He would have us to do.

"Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended, shall not find occasion of stumbling, in Me." Could words more tenderly express what St. Paul calls His "gentleness" or His equity? He knew that there would be "difficulties," that faith would have to fight her way through adversaries; that questions would be pressed which in this world could have no full answer; that prejudice, misapprehension, or impatient craving for "sight" or a sensible evidence, would lead many to "go back and walk with him no more." He knew it, He knows it now. But as then, so now, He is ever ready to hear the honest, not hopeless, petition, "I believe; help Thou mine unbelief." For answer He points to the open door of His Father's spiritual sanctuary. Let us breathe the air of that solemn precinct, in some one or other of its many chambers, wherein we may be "kept from the strife of tongues," and brace up again the shaken nerves of our faith; let us beg Him to attract us by the unexhausted power of His "uplifting," to unfold to us, as we can bear it, the beauty of His absolute truth and holiness, to guide us, amid the bewilderments of this world, by His counsel, and at last to receive us into His glory.

O, well for those to whom at last, after any amount of toil, or weariness, or anxiety, or, perhaps, prolonged bodily anguish, this comes, this supreme compensation, to be present, to be at home, with the Lord. . . . . It has come, we doubt not, within the last few days, to one of whom, just now, it is hard for his friends to speak. Yet something must be said; one could not quite be silent under the oppressive sorrow of that immense loss which has unexpectedly fallen upon this House, upon Oxford, upon the whole Church of England, upon many who for years have counted his friendship among the chief blessings of this life. Something must be said; but what? One cannot, here and now, attempt to dwell on the great career which has so lately closed in what may be called its public aspects. Of course we remember him as a preacher of supreme excellence, as a constructive Catholic theologian of the first order, as an unwavering defender of the spiritual character of the Church, and of the rights which that character involved. But now, while the grave in his own vast cathedral has not yet opened to receive his corpse, we here in Christ Church may be pardoned if we think rather of the Henry

Liddon whom we ourselves have known so long and have loved so admiringly and, let me add, so gratefully. We recall the charm of that intense, unique personality, at once so commanding and so attractive; that conversation, so enriching, so illuminating, with its brilliance and its humour, its fulness and energy of thought, its refined and perfect accuracy of expression; we think of what he was as a friend, how tender, helpful, and faithful, how pathetically generous in his estimate of the most trivial kindnesses; of the pains which he would take in answering questions even when he was well-nigh tired out; of the sympathy which he would spend on the difficulties or the anxieties of others; of the exquisite old-world courtesy which flowed forth, simply and without effort, to persons of all sorts and conditions, on the principle of "Honour due to all men for the Son of Man's sake." Yes, and we must needs also be mindful of the responsibility incurred by frequent intercourse with one who could always be relied upon as an example of high unselfishness, of absolute superiority to the influences of what St. John calls the world, which, in the words of this day's Epistle, was crucified for him through Christ. Even those who did not always agree with him must always have been sure of him on that point, and would have understood him had they heard him say, as I have heard him say more than once, "Whatever happens one must keep one's loyalty to our Lord; to compromise that would be the worst of all bargains; nothing else will answer in the long run." The fact was that he had his eye fixed, ever more and more steadfastly fixed, on the end of life, on the world unseen, on the judgment to come. Those who know his published *Advent Sermons* will remember passage after passage in which the certainty and the significance of death are pressed home on the mind with an austere yet most charitable emphasis. "It is certain," he says, "that we shall die, and in death we shall be, each of us, alone. None other can enter into that tremendous experience which awaits us all. To prepare for death, then, is the true work, the common sense of life" (i. 82). "You do not know how you will die, or when, or where" (ii. 303). In words which perhaps were prompted by a well-known poem from the hand of the great Cardinal who passed but shortly before him into the world of spirits, he proceeds to speak of the "approach, stealthy or rapid, of a sense of internal collapse and ruin, of the advancing, overwhelming darkness, the felt retreat of life, first from this sense or organ, then from that . . . . the last spasm, the last sigh, and then," in "the first five minutes after death," the awful "entrance in a new and wonderful world," involving, under totally strange conditions, a "direct apprehension, a vision," of God.

Just a few more words, if you will bear with them. He of whom we are thinking did live, ever more and more consciously, in the presence of God, as it encompasses and dominates the soul that has learned to behold the glory of the Father in the person of the co-eternal Son, incarnate for us men and for our salvation. Yes, on this Holy Cross Day, we may well think of him as devoted to the Crucified Redeemer, the infallible, impeccable, adorable Lord Jesus. All his thoughts about religion, including his contention for the Catholic faith as embodied in the Creeds of the Church, or for the operations of the Incarnate life, by means of the Holy Spirit, through sacramental ordinances, and ultimately even all the convictions which, as an English Churchman, he held so fast, ran up into, and took their force and meaning and sanction from that fact which for him was above all, beneath all, around all—the reality, the presence, the rights, the character of God as revealed in Christ. "God and the Soul" is the title of the discourse which stands first in the series of his Oxford sermons. One which I heard him utter from this place, full thirty years ago, concludes with an exhortation to rise above the world of sense, to realise "the life of grace," to "pierce the veil by prayer," and to "lift up our hearts to our ascended Lord."

Here, then, is at least one lesson which the life of this great Christian enforces on us: "Hold fast," it says, "your religious loyalty to a living God and a personal Christ." And if we could imagine him as speaking to us now from the Paradise where assuredly he sees, more or less in open vision, the Lord to Whom he consecrated that rich array of faculties with a single heartedness so entire and so consistent, we might well suppose him to take up the Psalmist's words, and to assure us that it is good, the truest good, for us to hold fast by God, to put our trust in His work and love, to beg that He will be the strength of our souls and the light of our consciences, will hold us by our right hand in our passage through this world, and be our portion in life, in death, and for eternity.

SPOILED SALT.

By the Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, Hon. Canon of Manchester.

Sermon Preached at the Temple, Deauville, France.

"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men."—Matthew v. 13. Compare also Mark ix. 50, and Luke xiv. 34, 35.

THIS saying of our Saviour's about salt is one that He seems to have repeated at several different times. The fact of its frequent repetition is sufficient to fix our attention upon it as a very important one, and to induce us to give to it the

time and the study, which is required to understand its meaning.

Certain early anti-Christian writers, of whom (if I remember right), the first was Celsus, whose memory Origen has immortalised by singling him out as "a foeman worthy of his steel," declared that the saying was an absurd one, because salt never can be spoiled, or lose its seasoning properties, unless it itself is entirely washed away, so as altogether to disappear, in which case there is nothing left "to be trodden under foot of men." I do not know whether that objection is chemically correct or not. Nor is it very material to determine; for this answer may be given—that the salt of commerce, or of cookery, as it existed in those days, was full of impurities, largely mixed with earthy particles, and that it was quite possible for all useful saltness to be washed out of such a compound, leaving nothing behind but a tasteless powder, out of which all preservative or seasoning properties were gone. I think this answer a sufficient one; and the idea which it contains will be found, as we shall shortly see, to bring out the force and meaning of our Lord's words.

Our first question will be—What did He mean by salt?

He used the word first in the Sermon on the Mount, when addressing a congregation of Jews, whom He had recently gathered round him as His disciples. He told them they were the salt of the earth, as in deed and in truth, the Israelitish nation was. It alone possessed that pure and noble belief in one only God, and that enlightened conviction that God is holy, and requires nothing but holiness from His votaries, which was the one sound and preserving element in the world that He then saw around Him.

So that, in that first discourse, the salt was a *people* in possession of great and noble truths, destined, by virtue of that possession of theirs, to have a conservative influence on the whole world.

The other times, when He used the word, He seems to have looked deeper into the inward nature of the preservative influence, and to have meant the truths themselves (coupled with those further ones, which He was then in the act of teaching), the old revelation given to Moses, and the new revelation, taught by Himself, which was to be its supplement. In these was the preserving virtue, which could alone save the world from moral corruption, and from that dissolution and misery, which sooner or later must fall on every human society, by which the divine moral laws are broken or neglected.

Thus the salt of the earth is, first of all, the religious truths themselves; and then, secondly, a people by whom the truths have been embraced, in whom they have become embodied, and by whom they are taught, and propagated, and exemplified in the world. Of the truths themselves it is probably the fact that they cannot possibly be spoiled. The principles on which are based the goodness and happiness of the human race are and ever must be the same. But the people, in whom they are embodied, are subject to the most pitiable changes. The salt in them may become so mixed with earthy particles as to be useless for the work of moral regeneration; and it may even be so washed out of them as entirely to disappear, leaving nevertheless a residuum, or semblance, of itself, which still retains its name. It was so with the Jews in our Saviour's time: it may become so with Christians now. It may happen now, as then, that religion, which is the salt of the world, may become spoiled, unsalted—its inward essence departed, and nothing but the earthy particles, which have adulterated it, remaining, so that those who once hoped and believed in it may be left exclaiming in despair, Wherewith shall the world be seasoned and preserved? It may happen that the earthy particles, which are mixed with true religion, even at the best, may be all of it that is left, its name still remaining, but all its preservative influence gone.

When the salt has thus become unsalted, religion itself becomes a thing rejected and despised, and, as our Lord expresses it, trodden under foot of men.

This is an evil which may be found more or less in all times. Let us venture to look it in the face as a thing existing in our own.

I think that, a generation ago, it would have been accepted as a truism, that, as has been said, religion is really the salt of the world—its one great preservative influence. *Now* the fact would be disputed. It would be said, in reply to Christian advocates—"You attribute to religion more than is really due to it. Man may love his brother man whom he has seen, without loving God whom he has not seen. A pure and noble life, careful dutifulness, strict justice, self-sacrificing philanthropy, are all possible, and all actually exist, in persons who have no belief in an unseen world, or in an Unseen Being, Who created us and all things visible. If you love your neighbour as yourself, you need not strive to rise in thought to Him, Whom you have not seen, and Whom, scientifically, you can never know. You may be purified yourself by an ardent enthusiasm for the good and happiness of your brother man; and, in that enthusiastic love of humanity, and not in religion, is to be found the true salt of the world—its real preservative influence."

Many of the higher class of minds go, consciously or unconsciously, through such a process of thought, and then, having reached the conclusion that religion is not the salt of the world, either withdraw from religious observances altogether, or else maintain them, only as a matter of habit or of decency, in deference to the usages of the society in which they move, without any inward faith remaining.

It is said—I do not know whether truly—that this

has happened to a very great extent in the country, in which we are for the moment sojourning. We are told that a very large part of the men of France, and amongst these a number of enlightened, honest, high-principled, virtuous persons, rarely enter the churches, having lost their faith in Christianity, as presented to them by their clergy, and perhaps in Christianity itself.

The same thing occurs, though not yet so generally, in our own country. Let me quote one example to represent a multitude, which every observant person could relate out of his own experience. A little while ago an infirm old lady was talking to me about her son and her son-in-law, both middle-aged men. Her son, she said, was an excellent son, who was kindness itself to her, who would do anything for his mother, and even take her to church on the few occasions she was able to go there, but would never go there on his own account, for he said that what took place there was a humbug. Her son-in-law, she said, always used to go when he was younger, but now made excuses when invited, and always absented himself when he could. I believe that both of these were men of good moral character, and one of them at least was eminently obedient to the First Commandment with promise. Perhaps every one could quote out of his own experience instances exactly similar.

In these cases, the salt had, for certain persons at least, lost its savour, and was being cast out and trodden under foot of men.

Now this distaste for, and dislike of religion is, no doubt, in part the fault of those who have given up the practice of it, and proceeds from moral defects in their hearts and in their lives. But with those defects *we* here present, who are all more or less professors of religion, have no concern. We have not to judge or condemn those who have placed themselves outside of religious communion and practice. But we have to consider whether there is anything in our own practice of religion, which has robbed it of its attractive taste, and of its saving influence on those without. If the salt have lost its saltness for many, is it in any degree our fault? the fault of professing Christians? the fault of ministers of religion? Let us seriously face that question.

Is not, perhaps, the cause of this distaste, that, in so much of the religion of our time, the essence has disappeared, and left little except the earthy mixtures remaining? Men treat it as an unreality and an insincerity, because it has become such, in so many of its professors, and so many of its teachers.

Now here would be the point for a criticism of contemporary religion, as presented by the Scribes and Pharisees—the priests, prelates, and preachers of our own day. And such a criticism would be very useful, if we had any one present good enough to make it. Our Lord, we know, denounced, with extreme severity, the religious world of His own day. Woe after woe came thundering from His lips, not directed against the publicans and sinners, but against the ὑποκρίται, the actors of religion. But we, if we were to follow His example in this point, should only be noting the mote in our brother's eye, when perhaps a beam is in our own, and should perhaps arrive at the great fault of the hypocrites themselves, and be found thanking God that we are not as other men are. So that part of the subject must stand over until the rise of a real prophet of the Lord—until the advent of "the Christ that is to be."

But we may, and we must, criticise our own religion, and find whether it still contains the true preservative influence, the true saving grace, or whether that has departed, and left nothing but the earthy mixtures behind. If we do this seriously and honestly, we shall probably make some very unpleasant discoveries. We need help and guidance in the search, and such we can only get from our Lord Himself. And He has provided it. For it was, with the express object of renewing the saving power of the salt of the world, that He preached His Sermon on the Mount.

That most important document was our Saviour's own solemn call, away from the religion of the Scribes and Pharisees—the religion of ceremonial function, of formal observance, of vain repetitions (βαττολογεῖν), and of many words (πολυλογία), and still more from the religion of personal self-interest and self-display, to the religion of the (ταμιεῖον), secret place, and of the heart, the religion of trust, of self-denial, of charity, and of truthfulness. Each of His disciples was to realise His own personal relation to a Father in heaven, so as to love Him, and trust Him, and to live and act for His sake, and beneath His eye. Religious observances—prayers, alms-givings, fastings, were to be, not for the world, nor even for the synagogue or Church, but only for that Father: these were not to be formal observances, but expressions of genuine love. In close and immediate personal intercourse with the Father could only be acquired those higher and nobler motives, which lift a person above worldliness, and make him a subject of the true kingdom or reign of heaven. In secret communing with Him must be formed that character which makes human beings truly blessed, with an inward happiness, which is proof against persecution or loss, or want, or any other form of earthly suffering.

In such intercourse with the Heavenly Father, who is perfect, and in that alone, can men learn those qualities which make religion tasteful to the higher and more truthful minds, and preservative to the world. There they may learn to be poor in spirit, pure in heart, merciful, and greedy of righteousness, so as to be happy in themselves, and, by their example and influence, sources of righteousness and happiness to all the world. If this personal intercourse with the Father ceases, then the salt is gone, which might have preserved the world, and nothing but the earthy mixtures are left

in the religion of the individual, or of the congregation.

The conclusion then is, for us, as for the Jews of the time of Christ, that, if religion is to regain that savour which makes it tasteful to higher and purer minds, and that preserving influence which it ought to exercise, each person, who professes it, must renew his own personal hold on his Heavenly Father, and thus regain the genuineness, truthfulness, and reality, which are missing in the religion of the day.

And religious teachers, if they would escape the severe judgments pronounced upon the Scribes and Pharisees, and save their faith from being despised, and rejected, and trodden under foot of men, must lead others, instead of ceremonial observances, instead of earthly partisanship, instead of schemes of sacerdotal or ecclesiastical power, to seek first the kingdom of God—His reign or ascendancy over their own hearts; and His righteousness—that elevated and purified inward disposition and moral life, which is the end and aim of all the Commandments.

All this to be sought from the Father in heaven, who sees in secret, and acts in secret, and who, unlike human teachers, whose ceremonies and preaching are all full of imperfections, is absolutely perfect, and infuses His own perfection into those hearts which are lifted up direct and secretly to Him.

Nor did our Lord ever recede from the principles or the tone of this His first teaching.

He ignored absolutely the ceremonial of the Temple, even while teaching in its courts, and dealt very freely with the round of appointed days. The only Jewish institution which He honoured by His observance was the domestic celebration of the Passover. For the stately building itself He had no admiration, but regarded it as a fabric of stones, which must shortly be cast down. The traditions of the ancient Church He only mentioned to condemn, as a series of human dogmas, apt to make void the law of God. The Scribes, the successors of Moses, He denounced as blind guides to the people. The priests, the sons and successors of Aaron, felt His hostility so keenly, that, at the head of the representative body of the Church in full council assembled, they pronounced Him worthy to die.

And if, at any time, religion resolves itself again into these same outward and earthly things—ceremonial, a round of sacred days, stately buildings, ecclesiastical traditions, clerical succession and authority—then, in it, the earthy mixtures have overpowered the salt, and it earns for itself justly the contempt and disregard of men. In such a case, the only remedy for its professors and teachers is to find their way back, individually and collectively, to the Father who sees in secret, and thus to learn from Himself again the missing reality and truth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1890.

ARCHDEACON FARRAR'S SERMON.

ARCHDEACON FARRAR has delivered his sermon on "General" Booth's scheme of social amelioration. Money is now commencing to flow into "General" Booth's coffers. Titled personages, professional men and philanthropic ladies are forwarding contributions, and it now seems more than probable that the chief of the Salvation Army will obtain the requisite funds for testing the efficacy of his programme. In one sense it is well that the scheme should be tried. We have in previous articles explained why we think it will not, and should not, succeed. But so much prominence has been accorded to it by the somewhat hysterical approval of high personages that, if it now failed for want of a trial, it would, comparatively, be more successful than if the trial succeeded. It is difficult to criticise a scheme of this kind without incurring the odium of imputed malice. We express our disapproval of what we consider an illogical and ill-digested programme, and we at once come under the lash of Archdeacon Farrar, who declares that we "sneer, pick holes, and riot in offensive personalities." Here is, if there ever was, a revolutionary scheme. The natural laws of sequence, of cause and effect, are ignored. The social scum is to be clarified into purity; mental and physical uncleanness is to disappear; rogues and vagabonds are to be transformed, by a process as rapid as that of the renewal of Dr. Faustus's youth, into good citizens. And there must be no criticism because, according to Archdeacon Farrar, to criticise is to sneer. Why, a Bill to shorten the hours of labour of the working classes would arouse the *pro* and *con* eloquence of thousands, would occupy Parliament many nights, and would not be passed or rejected until an entire

army of newspaper columns had marched and counter-marched upon it. But a more sweeping proposal, and one involving the expenditure of large sums of money, is supposed worthy to pass into law without comment. It may said that the money to be spent is freely given by the donors, who have a right .to do what they please with their own. But such a remark displays great ignorance of social as well as political economy. The law rightly forbids the asking of alms, and submits the person "begging" to a scrutiny as to his claim to receive.

Archdeacon Farrar is a man for whom we have always had considerable admiration. Socialistic as his tendencies are, we have never denied that he is influenced by motives of kindness and unselfish desire to benefit his fellow-men. But on a question which involves more than personal philanthropy we cannot, without protest, permit surely the most illogical remarks that ever fell from the lips of a high ecclesiastic to pass unchallenged. We had not the opportunity of hearing the sermon in question, and our comments are founded on the *Times* report. According to that report, the keynote of the whole sermon was in the following remarkable sentence :—"Those who saw any good in the scheme were bound to help it forward, and those who disapproved of it were bound to propose or forward something better." Let us examine this proposition. With regard to the first clause, granted, with certain restrictions. Those who see "some good" in the scheme should first assay the scheme to discover whether the proportion of gold to alloy is according to standard. Then, by all means, let them help it forward. But that those who disapprove of it are bound to propose or forward something better is surely bad logic, unsound argument, and, in short, nonsense. If this declaration is to pass current, then the moment the versatile and volatile editor of *Truth* proposes something chimerical in Parliament, it is the duty of her Majesty's responsible Ministers to "cap" it by proposing or forwarding something more visionary; when Ireland asks for Home Rule, it is the duty of the disapproving majority to bestow something better, say the Abrahamic patriarchal rule with Mr. Parnell as Abraham; when a Royal Academy critic ventures to state that an Academician's subject is poorly chosen, it is his duty forthwith to "propose and forward" *i.e.*, select and paint a better; when a reviewer points out alleged blemishes in Archdeacon Farrar's literary work, it is his duty to write a better book. Illustrations might be multiplied *ad infinitum*—in fact, *ad absurdum*. And yet a proposition so false was gravely listened to!

In writing these words we have no intention of "rioting in personalities." But we must point out a glaring inconsistency in the Archdeacon's sermon. He is reported to have said: "Of course the scheme might fail, for toilsome and incomplete were the best efforts of man. If to die amidst the howl of the world's disapproval were failure, Luther, Wesley, and Whitfield failed; and if to die on the cross amid the jeers of the mob and priests were failure, Jesus Christ Himself failed." Surely that parallel might have been spared! And if it be granted that the Master and His three disciples mentioned did not fail, then, surely, failure is predoomed to "General" Booth's scheme, because instead of the "howl of the world's disapproval' there is the patronage of royal and titled personages, and instead of the "jeers of the mob and priests" there is the spectacle of approval without consideration by mob and priests. "General" Booth's scheme would have been healthier if submitted to discipline. Jeshurun was neither happy nor healthy when he waxed fat.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE MESSENGER" for October and November both contain one or two interesting papers. Whilst not confessing ourselves converts to its propaganda, we cannot fail to admire the zeal, activity, and marvellous ingenuity of its supporters. We should strongly advise any who desire food for thought "to dip into" *The Messenger*. We are particularly glad of the tone which such articles as "Holy Baptism" (in the October number) give to it. *The Messenger* is certainly produced in a very effective form.

"THE TREASURY" for October contains, among other things, a most valuable sermon by Dr. Matthews. There seems a freshness of expression and a novelty of thought in *The Treasury* sermons, which is most refreshing, and which apart from their value to our own clergy makes them well worth reading. We always look forward to the arrival of *The Treasury*.

As a testimony to the excellent work done by the Church of England Burial Reform Association, Sir Chas. Lowther, one of its patrons, has removed all the bodies from his family vaults, and interred them in the churchyard. It is to be hoped that this example will be largely followed by others.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows :—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—I have much pleasure in adopting. and stating as my own conclusion, the following words from Dr. Donaldson's letter in the PULPIT of the 8th.

"I see no difficulty in St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, nor in St. James's doctrine of justification by works, nor in the mode of reconciling the two, and hence cannot entertain any fear as to the consequences of letting men's minds come into immediate contact with the difficulties of Scripture."

It is now evident that there is no real difference of belief between him and me on the subject of justification.

He says also :—"There is very often a vagueness about Mr. Murphy's language, which, when rendered precise, and its logical consequences pressed home on his attention, he immediately cries out, 'I did not say that.' But this won't absolve him from the implications of his language."

This appears to mean that Dr. Donaldson thinks himself justified in quoting, as my words, his own opinion as to what would be the logical inference from my words. I do not agree with him in this.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, Nov. 10th, 1890.

SIR,—I do not think we make much progress in forming our estimate of what is Confirmation Grace. Certain it is, Mr. Lawrence does not help on the argument this week. Why is it? Truly, he says, "Baptismal Grace," he believes, "is given in answer to prayer"; but in his next sentence he contradicts this statement, for he says, "Prayer is not always answered in the way or at the time that those who offer it expect." Baptismal Grace then cannot mean Grace given at Baptism. We are, therefore, as yet no further forward.

I think I said that I did not place instinct, reason and faith in the same category, if by that we were to understand that the things, as principles of action, were equal. Faith is a gift of God, and can *not* be exercised in Juggernaut. I fear that what I understand by faith is as far as possible from Mr. Lawrence's conception of it as it well can be. We had better have definitions; for we are evidently at sea.

We will take the problem as Mr. Lawrence puts it: "To show that men's reason apprehends God when He reveals Himself." I think it will tax Mr. Lawrence's wit to the utmost to prove his position. I am anxious to see how he will set to work.

When I asked the question, What is a faculty? and gave the answer, it was both a definition (understood) and an illustration. Mr. Lawrence knows the necessity for brevity in newspaper correspondence.

It would exhaust more space than you can afford to take up all the points raised in Mr. Lawrence's penultimate paragraph, and so I will only advert to one or two things. Understanding is the outcome of the intellect. It is that in action. Lower animals have reason as far as they have intellect, if they have it all. I was talking to a Professor of a Continental University a little while ago on kindred subjects. Amongst other things, he said, *Ich habe keine seele.* And he reasoned that the only difference between his intellect and that of the animal was one of degree.

There are two senses in which faith is taken. We have an analogy in intellect and understanding—*intellectus* and *verstand.* Faith, with regard to the spirit, covers both these terms. It is, in other words, the name of the function and of the outcome. If Mr. Lawrence will think this out, he will readily see how faith should be a function and a principle too.

Mr. Lawrence must pardon my saying that his last paragraph is quibbling. Reason leads a man to drink whiskey. Instinct leads a dog to run away from it. Is instinct opposite to reason? Reason led Cardinal Newman to one course of conduct. Faith would have led him to another and, as I think, a better. Is faith opposite to reason? Is it not above it?

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, November 8th, 1890.

P.S.—I fear that there is very little that we can do, beyond teaching, for removing the evils of which "A Clergyman for Forty Years" complains. The help is not in us, and his letter too well illustrates this. It is just as easy to explain one thing as another; but the enlightenment must come from above. Our prayer should, therefore, be, "Lord, revive Thine own work."

THE BISHOP OF MEATH'S SERMON.

SIR,—Perhaps you would kindly permit me to reply to your note appended to my letter on the Bishop of Meath's sermon, in the PULPIT of the 1st inst., by saying that Mr. Maundrell did not find the salt, which he examined, "in the earth," nor "mixed with earth, clay, or any other substance," but in a "rock," from which "he *broke* a piece," and found by "proof" that the part exposed to the sun had lost its savour, while the side which had been connected with the rock still retained its savour. The "proof" which he made was, I assume, the tasting of it; and surely we must allow to him that he knew the taste of salt, and that his "fancy" did not lead him astray on that occasion. Even had he found it "in the earth," "dissolved by the rain," and "washed out of other substances with which it was mixed," it was just as likely in that case that he would have seen the "crystals" of salt as of any other substance. So that your "assurance" does not stand very well in the face of the important fact stated by Mr. Maundrell.

Dr. A. Clarke, in his commentary *in loco,* tells us that "there was a species of salt in Judæa, which was generated at the Lake Asphaltites, and hence called bituminous salt, easily rendered *vapid,* and of no other use but to be spread in a part of the temple, to prevent slipping in wet weather; and that the existence of such a salt, and its application to such a use, Schœttgenius has largely proved in his *Horæ Hebraicæ,* Vol. I. p. 18." Now what I am anxious to point out and maintain is, that our Lord spoke truly, in accordance with this fact, then patent to all His hearers, when He spoke of salt losing its savour; and that He did not speak in accordance with the "level of His age" by attributing to "common salt" a property which it did not possess.

I asked for proof that "Christ emptied Himself of the knowledge of times and seasons, *which as mere God* He must have possessed"; but the text you furnish me with is no proof of this, but rather the

opposite. The text simply means that Christ in His *human nature* did not know the day of Jerusalem's destruction. "Such as the Father is, such is the Son," in His Divine nature; and when the Son became incarnate there were in His person "two *whole* and *perfect*" natures, so that if the Father knew the day of Jerusalem's destruction, so did the Son in His Divine nature know it also; consequently only of the human nature could it be predicated that the "Son did not know that day."

Bishop Newton's words on this text are full of wisdom. He says in his "Dissertations," page 429, that "Christ may be considered in two respects, in His human and His Divine nature; and what is said with regard only to the former, doth not at all affect the latter. In like manner it may be said, that though as God He might know all things, yet He might be ignorant of some things, as man. And of this particular the Messiah might be ignorant, because it was no part of His office or commission to reveal it." Dr. Macknight takes the same view, and maintains that οἶδεν has the force of the Hebrew conjugation Hiphel, in which verbs are taken in a causative, declarative, or permissive sense; and that it means here, make known, or promulge, as it is to be understood in 1 Cor. ii. 2. Which implies that "this event was not to be *made known* either by angels or men, nor even by the Son of Man Himself, but that it should be *made known* by the Father only in the execution of the purpose of His justice.

As you have undertaken to answer for the Bishop, I hereby ask you to produce one single text of Scripture which teaches plainly and explicitly that our "*Lord was not omniscient in His Divine nature during the time of His incarnation among men.*" I believe this strange declaration has no proof in Scripture, and it certainly has no warrant in the creeds of our church.

You say there is a "wide difference" in the meanings of the words prerogative and attribute; would you kindly tell me where the "wide difference" is, or how it exists? Is not every prerogative an attribute? If not, where did God get His prerogatives, or who gave them to Him? The Bishop calls "the knowledge, which as mere God, Christ had of times and seasons," a prerogative: I have called it an attribute; but I shall not quarrel about the terms he employs so long as I know what he means. You say I use these words "synonymously," which the Bishop does not do; but then you forget that he does not use the word "attribute" at all.

R. DONALDSON.

5th November, 1890.

[We admit that rock-salt—a very impure substance, and said, in the neighbourhood of Lake Asphaltites (or Dead Sea), to be very largely mixed with mineral pitch or asphalte—may lose its savour when it has had all its salt washed out of it by rain, etc., but that circumstance is no proof that the salt itself loses its savour, which is the only point in dispute. It is of little use adducing texts to our correspondent, who interprets them in a non-natural and fanciful sense. There were two or three occasions on which our Saviour admitted that He was unable to work miracles, and justified Shakespeare's saying,

> "There's nothing situate under Heaven's eye
> But hath his bound in earth, in sea, in sky."

As to the difference in the meaning of "attribute" and "prerogative," we refer our correspondent to his English Dictionary.—ED.]

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—I find that it will not be possible (as I had hoped it might be) to compress all that remains to be said within the limits of a single letter. To-day I should like to call attention to the marked Jewish characteristics of the Third Gospel. I venture to assert that—

I.—THE AUTHOR OF THE THIRD GOSPEL WAS A JEW FAMILIAR WITH THE SEPTUAGINT.

This is evident from—(*a.*) *The Quotations.*—"In the citations in the Third Gospel from the Old Testament .... there are plain marks of the use of the Septuagint version." — (*Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.*)

"All the quotations from the Old Testament in the Acts, as Dr. Davidson remarks, are taken from the LXX. They amount to more than fifty. The speech of Stephen, before the Jewish council, forms a compendium of the Old Testament drawn up in Septuagintal extracts." "When our Lord took up the Prophet Isaiah in the synagogue at Nazareth, He must either have quoted immediately from the LXX., as Walton supposes, or it was subsequently adjusted to that version." (Cf. Luke iv. 18, 19, and Isaiah lxi. 1, 2). (Grinfield.)

(*b.*) *The Subject-Matter.*—"Luke opens his history in the temple at Jerusalem. . . . The first part, the Gospel, commences with the account of an appearance of an angel in the holy place, to prepare the way for the testimony to be borne to the Messiah by John, the last of the Prophets. As we advance, a parallel is drawn .... which brings out the universal character of the *Gospel* mission, as contrasted with that of the *Law*. .... The book ends with the command to the disciples to continue in *Jerusalem*, and the statement that they were continually *in the Temple*. The first part having thus shown in its true essence the spiritual establishment of the new covenant, which was destined for all nations, and the transition from the Old Testament to the New; the second part, the Acts of the Apostles, is occupied with an account of the manner in which the Christian Church was first of all founded . . . in Jerusalem, in theoretically holy ground, and in the very presence of the older covenant; and then after the Apostle Peter had demonstrated in a set oration its perfect accordance with Old Testament prophecy, spread far beyond the one nation of the Jews . . . to Rome the very centre of the heathen world." (Ebrard, *Gospel History*, p. 100.)

Moreover as we have just seen, "The speech of Stephen forms a compendium of the Old Testament;" and we find throughout the narrative of the Third Gospel and the Acts, references to Moses and the Prophets, and to the heroes of Hebrew history, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Samuel, Saul, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Joel.

(*c.*) *From its Aim and Object.*—"We can have no scruple in describing the tendency of the Acts as conciliatory, and itself as an attempt at mediation between Judaists and Paulinists." "Our author wishes to allay the strife . . . to establish peace between the two parties." (Zeller, *Acts*, ii. pp. 115, 154). "The Acts of the Apostles are also an *Eirenicon*, a 'tendency-writing,' a book with an object." (Farrar.)

Now it is quite clear that this attempt at conciliation must have come from some liberally-minded Jew and not from a Gentile, whom as *Gentile* the bigoted

Jewish Christian despised as "common and unclean," and no better than "a heathen man and a publican." Some idea of the bitterness of this bigotry may be gathered from the account of St. Paul's address to the Jews at Jerusalem: "They gave him audience unto this word ('I will send thee far hence unto the *Gentiles'*), and then lifted up their voices and said: 'Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live'" (Acts xxii. 21, 22).

The strong feeling of the Judaising Christians may be seen in the statement, "When Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them" (Acts xi. 2, 3). It was because St. Peter gave way to these prejudices, "fearing them which were of the circumcision," that St. Paul, the champion of the Gentile Christians "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal. ii. 11, 12). In this state of friction and high pressure between the Judaising and the Gentile Christians, it would obviously have been quite useless for a *Gentile* to interpose as mediator—only an earnest and devout and liberally-minded *Jew* could have any hope of intervening with success, and of making peace between the contending parties.

(*d.*) *From its Phraseology and Style.*—As to the general use of the LXX., Bishop Walton, quoted by Grinfield (*Apology for the Septuagint*, p. 139) says that, "It was publicly read in the synagogues for near three hundred years before Christ; that our Saviour and the Apostles read it, and cited it more frequently than the Hebrew text, and thereby consecrated it to posterity; that by this translation chiefly (which was by the Apostles left to the Church of Christ) the Church, especially among the Gentiles, was first gathered, and by it nourished and built up, and the world subdued to Christ; that for many centuries no other translation but this, and such as were made out of it (excepting the Syriac) was used in the Church, nor is any other used in the Greek Church to this day; that this was that which the Greek and Latin Fathers expounded, and illustrated, out of which they instructed the people, confuted heresies and maintained the truth.

Grinfield, that great authority on the LXX., says:—"The most remarkable and important feature of this version (the LXX.) consists in its regular selection of the same doctrinal words and expressions as those which were subsequently adopted by the Evangelist and Apostles. The terms repentance, faith, righteousness, justification, redemption, sanctification, etc., are the very same in the Alexandrine version as in the New Testament, and they are used in precisely the same meaning." And he quotes with approval the statement of Professor Stuart, who says: "The truth is that there is not a page, nor even a paragraph of any considerable length, which does not bear the impress of the Old Testament upon it. What else is the so-called *idiom* of the Hebrew-Greek of the New Testament but an impression of this kind?"

Bishop Pearson, in the preface to his edition of the LXX., quoted by Grinfield, says: "There are many words in the New Testament which, from the mere usage of the Greek tongue, cannot be understood, which by collation with the Hebrew and the usage of the LXX. become easily intelligible. No one knows what σάρξ, what πνεῦμα signify, among the Greek authors; and if you collect all the senses in which the Greeks use these words, you will find none that will reach the Apostles' meaning. . . . Hence it becomes necessary to explain σάρξ from the genius of the Hebrew language, and the version of the LXX. . . . So . . . . whenever the Apostles use πνεῦμα in a sense foreign to the Greek tongue, the passages wherein it is so used must be explained by the Hebrew idiom and the Septuagint version."

Whence should we know what ῥῆμα, Luke i. 37, οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τῷ θεῷ πᾶν ῥῆμα, unless we recollect what is written in Gen. xviii. 14, which the LXX. translates Μὴ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα; and consider that דבר not only signifies a *word*, but any *matter*, *business*, or *transaction?* Or whence should we know what force or particular emphasis τὸ δικαίουν and τὸ δικαιοῦσθαι have, in the Apostles' usage of these expressions, unless the Hebrew צדק had been used in the same sense, and the LXX. had rendered it by these Greek words? In vain, among the ancient Greeks, will you enquire after the meaning of πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ, εἰς τὸν θεὸν, *to believe God, or in God;* πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Κύριον, and πρὸς τὸν θεὸν πίστις, *faith in the Lord, and faith towards God* . . . which yet are easily understood from the LXX. version. How should we guess at the meaning of ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ (Acts vii. 20) unless the Septuagint had rendered the Hebrew (Exod. ii. of Moses) by ἰδόντες δε αὐτον ἀστεῖον? All these expressions, mentioned by Bishop Pearson as derived from Jewish usage are to be found in the Third Gospel and the Acts.

Grinfield further observes that, "The Hellenistic style of the LXX. and of the New Testament is essentially based on the Hebrew idiom. With the exception of a few grammatical peculiarities, its characteristics are exclusively belonging to its Jewish origin." In his Hellenistic edition of the Greek Testament, he has "collected not less than 50,000 (*fifty thousand*) examples of citations, allusions, and parallels of thought and expression drawn from the Septuagint version and from the Apocrypha," the so-called writings of Luke form nearly *one-fifth* of the whole New Testament. This gives not far short of *ten thousand* of such allusions to, and reminiscences of, the Septuagint in the Third Gospel and the Acts. And, again, "None but Jews of the Dispersion could have written any considerable portion of either the LXX. or the Greek Testament. . . . . We may challenge any learning or ingenuity to set aside the philological evidence that the New Testament must have been composed by Hellenistic converts during the first century, and prior to the fall of Jerusalem. No such Greek phraseology long survived that event."

In the Third Gospel "Hebraisms are frequent" (*Dict. of Bible*). There are "very numerous Hebraisms in Luke's Gospel" (Alford). Olshausen refers to "the strong Hebraisms of the Acts."

"The apology before the Jews (Acts xxii. 1, 21) was spoken in Hebrew (Syro-Chaldaic). *Another* interesting question is therefore here involved, *Did Luke understand Hebrew?* . . . Now we do find that the speech is *full of Hebraisms.* . . . . It contains several expressions occurring *nowhere but in the writings of Luke.* . . . . Our inference then is . . . that Luke was *acquainted with Hebrew*" (Alford).

"More special and certain examples of grammatical Hebraisms are the following:—(1.) The verbal translation of Hebrew constructions which are opposed to the spirit of the Greek language; as ὁμολογεῖν ἐν τίνι βλέπειν ἀπὸ; *sibi cavere a;* προσέθετο πέμψαι; the formula εἰ δοθήσεται to express a negative oath. . . . . The use of the genitive of a noun expressing quality in the place of an adjective. These constructions may be considered pure Hebraisms" (Winer, p. 40). All the

above "pure Hebraisms" occur in the Third Gospel.

Winer also gives as examples of Hebraisms:—"Certain very common vernacular phrases" literally translated in Greek [from the Hebrew]: as "*πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετά τινος, ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα, ἄρτον φαγεῖν, αἷμα ἐκχέειν, καρπὸς ὀσφύος, ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός, στηρίζειν πρόσωπον, πᾶσα σάρξ*"; and he further mentions "*σπλαγνίζεσθαι, σκανδαλίζεσθαι, ἀναθεματίζειν, ὀρθρίζειν, προσωπολημπτεῖν.*" "Many expressions—such as *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*—would convey to a native Greek either an erroneous meaning or no meaning at all" (p. 34).

All the above Hebraistic expressions are to be met with in the Third Gospel and the Acts.

Again, p. 760, Winer speaks of "the Hebraistic *καὶ ἐγένετο.*" Now this Hebraistic impersonal *ἐγένετο*(=it came to pass) is used no less than sixty times throughout the Third Gospel and the Acts, forty-three times in the former, eighteen times in the latter (Schmoller). Bishop Wordsworth points out Hebraisms in Luke i. 37, 46, 68; vi. 38; x. 6 (*υἱος εἰρήνης*); xviii. 5; xx. 11, 21, 36 (*προσέθετο πέμψαι*); xxi. 24, 35; xxii. 15; and (in Luke xxiv. 18), says: "The use of *καὶ* here is similar to that of the Hebrew *Vau*. See . . . Gesenius ad Isaiah v. 4." We find, moreover, the Hebrew mode of measuring distance (in Acts i.), "A Sabbath day's journey," and the Hebrew way of reckoning time in Luke xxii.; Acts xii.; xx.; xxvii. 9. In this last passage "the Fast"—the only Jewish Fast—the Day of Atonement is mentioned; in the others the Passover Feast, "the days of unleavened bread" are referred to. There is also the "Feast of Weeks" Pentecost, mentioned in Acts ii. and xx.

Consider, also, such expressions as Priest, Levite, Sadducee, Pharisee, Publican, Scribe, the Law, Sabbath, circumcision, ruler of the synagogue, hypocrite, respecter of persons (*προσωπολήπτης*); searcher of hearts (*καρδιογνώστης*); abomination, Mammon, Beelzebub, Satan, false prophets, blasphemy, common (*κοίνος*) and clean (*καθαρός*) both applied to persons; Hebrew, Grecian (*Ἑλληνιστής*); stranger (*ἀλλογένης*). Are these to be found in the medical writers? Do they not express exclusive and peculiar Hebrew conceptions, and do they not point unmistakably to a *Jewish* origin? Add, too, such words as *κατασοφίζεσθαι, κατακρημνίζειν, ζωγρεῖν, κατανύσσειν, ἀποδεκατοῦν, ἄγγελος κυρίου ὤφθη, συγκύπτειν οὐρανοί*, plural; *οὐρανοί* is never found in the plural in classical writers; *ἀνατολή, ὀπτάνεσθα*, rare form; *ἀπαχθῆναι, διάδοχος, γέννημα, ἀνάθεμα, ἀποστασία λαξευτός, ἀνόητοι, ἄφρων, συνεχύθη, ἐνεργετεῖν. πρωτοστάτης, ψηλαφᾶν, καταδυναστεύειν*; all of which occur in the LXX., some being found nowhere else.

Among genuine Hebraisms, Mr. Webster (Syntax and Synonyms of New Testament) mentions: "Some peculiar forms of superlative . . . . *εὐλογημένη οὐ ἐν γυναιξί* (Luke i. 42); also the expressions, *πορευέσθαι ὀπίσω τινος* (Luke xxi. 8); *εἰς γενεὰς γενεών* (Luke i. 50); *ἤρεσεν ὁ λογος ἐνώπιον πάντος τοῦ πλήθους* (Acts vi. 57)." These forms, *ὀπίσω* (=after), and *ἐνώπιον* (=before), used in this redundant Hebraistic way are of common occurrence both in the Septuagint and the Third Gospel (with the Acts). Another marked Hebraism (as mentioned in Winer above) is the frequent use of the qualifying genitive in the place of the adjective, as in "unjust steward" (*ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας*); "unjust Judge" (*ὁ κρίτης τῆς ἀδικίος*). "La langue Hébraïque a peu d'adjectifs. Elle y supplée par l'emploi du génitif."—(Preiswerk, "Grammaire Hébraïque.")

We may also mention *ἡ σήμερον ἡμέρα; δή* with the imperative; *παρα πάντας* and *σκεύος* used metaphorically (Acts ix. 15, and Ps. xxx. 12); *κληθῆναι* and *εὑρηθῆναι*= to be; *ἔδωκε*=he appointed; *ὀνόματα*=persons (Acts i. 15); *ὁ ὑψίστος*=*ὁ θέος*. These are all Hebraistic echoes of the Septuagint. These stubborn facts cannot be set aside, because the writer also uses compound Greek words for which there is classical authority. "There is a would-be classical ring in such phrases as *ἀνατάζασθαι διήγησιν* . . . . All the more striking, therefore, are the modernisms which are continually cropping up in the midst of his most ambitious attempts. . . . . Notwithstanding all his Atticising tendencies, St. Luke exceeds all but St. John in modernisms."—(Geldart.) "The modern Greek appears to be derived chiefly from the language of the country people."—(Matthiae.) Some of St. Luke's modernisms are, of course, due to the ecclesiastical lessons taken from the Third Gospel; and other expressions called modernisms by Mr. Geldart are really reminiscences of the LXX.—*e.g.*, *ἐφημερία*. The author of the Third Gospel was not a classical writer, but a liberal, thoughtful, travelled Jew.

Speaking of the Third Gospel, Archdeacon Farrar refers to "the numerical continuity which marks the arrangement of the sections. In the sections and subsections we find a constant recurrence of the sacred numbers, 3 and 7." Now this "constant recurrence of the sacred numbers, 3 and 7" is just what we find in the Apocalypse—the most intensely Jewish book in the whole of the New Testament. And this cannot be explained by quotations embodied therein, taken from other works, but is connected with the structure of the book and the conception in the mind of the author.

I may perhaps be allowed to repeat some of the remarks I have made elsewhere:

"Any one who chooses to examine the phraseology of the Third Gospel and the Acts with the aid of Grinfield's *Novum Testamentum, Editio Hellenistica*, can soon satisfy himself that the author was a Jew who thought as well as wrote in a Hebraistic manner. Trace, for instance, his use *throughout* of *καὶ ἐγένετο*, occurring, as I have already mentioned, no less than *sixty times* as in Gen. vi. 2; *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ* with the infinitive as in Gen. xlii. 35; *εἶπε δὲ* as in Gen. xiv. 21; *καὶ ἰδοῦ* (occurring no less than *eighty* times) as in Gen. i. 31." Add to these the participle used with *εἰμι καὶ αὐτος* as in Gen. xlv. 26; *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε ἀναστὰς*, and *ἤρξατο* all frequently occurring in the Septuagint and the Third Gospel. These are all clear indications of the writer's *own Hebraistic style*, and cannot be explained as being due to quotations or to Aramaic documents incorporated in his narrative. "The writer of the Acts was a devout Jew, born and bred, so to speak, in the atmosphere of the temple and the synagogue, and reverently familiar from childhood and the dawn of thought with his own sacred Law and Prophets in the Greek version. No amount of study by one who was not born a Jew could in later years—when the character was formed and the opinions fixed—make up for his want of familiarity with the substance and diction of the Scriptures in youth, when the growing mind is most easily coloured and permanently impressed. . . . A Jew could not think and write as a Gentile, neither did nor could a Gentile think and write as a Jew. The words of Bishop Westcott as to St. John apply with equal point and force to the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts. 'The whole narrative shows that the author

was a Jew. He is familiar with Jewish opinions and customs; his composition is impressed with Jewish characteristics. His special knowledge in literary style all point to the same conclusion.'"

II.—THE JEWS WERE A PECULIAR PEOPLE, SEPARATED FROM ALL OTHER NATIONS.

"The people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations" (Numbers xxiii. 9). "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself above all the nations that are upon the earth" (Deut. xiv. 2).

"And Peter said unto them, Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean" (Acts x. 28).

The late Lord Chancellor Hatherley (*The Continuity of Scripture*) pointed out that "The law of the Jews separated them in every possible way from the heathen in their worship, in their social institutions, particularly that of marriage, and even in their food and garments."

Dean Alford (on Acts x. 28), has said: "Whatever *exceptions* there may have been, it was unquestionably the general *practice* of the Jews to separate in common life from uncircumcised persons. We have Juvenal testifying to this at Rome, Sat. xiv. 103 . . . and Tacitus, Hist. v. 8."

III.—THE JEWS KEPT THE SEPTUAGINT FOR THEIR OWN USE, AND DID NOT CIRCULATE IT AMONG THE GENTILES.

Dean Prideaux has declared that the fact that "no heathen writer but Demetrius only should make use of these Scriptures after they had been translated into Greek sufficiently shows how carefully the Jews, who were the first composers of this Version, kept and confined all other copies of it (except the one laid up in the King's Library at Alexandria) to their own use. They had the stated lessons read out of it in their synagogues, and they had copies of it at home for their private use, and thus they seem to have reserved it wholly to themselves till our Saviour's time."

IV.—LUKE REMAINED TO THE LAST AN UNCIRCUMCISED GENTILE.

The late Bishop Lightfoot, on Col. iv. 11, 14, has observed: "Luke is here distinguished from οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς (*i.e.*, 'converts from Judaism' . . . . or perhaps 'belonging to the circumcision'). This alone s fatal to his identification with the Lucius, St. Paul's 'kinsman' (*i.e.*, a Jew, etc.)." The Epistle to the Colossians was written in A.D. 62, the date Alford and other eminent critics assign to the Acts.

Archdeacon Farrar says: "It is clear, from St. Paul's allusions, that he was a Gentile convert, and that he had not been circumcised." This last important fact is fatal to the theory of those critics who have fancied that perhaps Luke was a Jewish proselyte; for, according to the Babylonian *Gemara*, as the learned Dr. John Lightfoot has observed: "He is no proselyte until he be circumcised and baptised." So, in Ex. xii. 43, 48, 49, we read: "This is the ordinance of the Passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof . . . . and when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover . . . let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it . . . . one law shall be to him that is home-born and to the stranger (προσήλυτος=proselyte) that sojourneth among you."

We find, in Gen. xvii. 12, 13, "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you . . . . he that is born in the house or bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, or he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised."

And in St. Matthew (x. 5) we read: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles"; and of an offending brother who will not be reconciled, "let him be to thee as a heathen man" (xviii. 17).

We have seen above how great an offence it was deemed by the Jewish Christians that Peter should have "gone in to men uncircumcised, and eaten with them" (Acts xi. 3). And we have also seen that "it was unquestionably the general *practice* of the Jews to separate themselves in common life from uncircumcised persons." (Alford.)

From all this it appears how utterly impossible it was for an uncircumcised Gentile to develop into, or to personate, a Jew. How could the Gentile possibly learn and adopt and make part of himself the characteristic modes of thought and peculiar expressions of the Jew? How can a man learn and adopt the views, the ways, the words of those who won't even speak to him? The author of the Third Gospel writes like a born Jew—only he is more educated, more enlightened, more liberally-minded, than most of his bigoted generation. It is scarcely necessary to add that it would have been obviously impossible for any Gentile convert to Christianity to have acquired these Jewish characteristics *after* his conversion; for there were no Gentile converts until A.D. 40 (Alford); and ten years later, in A.D. 50, the Council at Jerusalem decided that the Gentile converts—the brethren that are of the Gentiles—needed not to be "circumcised and keep the law" (Acts xv. 23, 24). From the first, they had been separate from the Jewish disciples; and from the first, St. Paul had been their teacher and guardian—St. Paul, "who gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour," to the Judaizers (Gal. ii. 5; Acts xi. 26). Therefore, as (1) the author of the Third Gospel was a Jew familiar with the Septuagint, and as (2) Luke was an uncircumcised Gentile, is it not perfectly clear that it is *utterly impossible that Luke could have been the author?* The only wonder is that any critic can be found, for one moment, to maintain such a hopeless paradox, such a palpable contradiction, such an inherent impossibility.

H. HEBER EVANS.

October 15th, 1890.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bailey, Rev. Granville R., Curate-in-Charge of the Mission District of Leycett, in the parish of All Saints', Madeley, Staffordshire; Vicar of St. John Evangelist's, Goldenhill, Stoke-on-Trent.

Bonney, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Rushbury, Church Stretton.

Browne, Rev. J. H., Organising Secretary of the Rochester Diocesan Society; Vicar of St. Margaret's, Rochester.

Cross, Hon. and Rev. C. F., M.A., Curate of New Brighton; Vicar of Shotwick, Cheshire.

Dimond-Churchward, Rev. M. D., M.A., Vicar of Northam; Diocesan Secretary of the C.E.T.S. for the Diocese of Exeter

Edmonds, Rev. Walter John, B.D., Vicar of St. George's, Tiverton, and Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral; Residentiary Canon in Exeter Cathedral.

Eliot, Rev. P. F., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bournemouth ; Dean of Windsor and Domestic Chaplain to the Queen.

Fookes, Rev. R. G., M.A., Lecturer in Divinity, and Chaplain of Pembroke College, Oxford.

Furze, Rev. W. S., Chaplain to the Suffolk County Asylum.

Harper, Rev. J. W., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Paul's, York-place, Edinburgh ; Rector of St. Peter's, Kirkcaldy, N.B.

Isherwood, Rev. R., M.A., Vicar of Stoke Row, Oxon.

Jukes, Rev. Worthington, M.A., Rector of Shobrooke, Devonshire.

Lawson, Rev. Robert, Vicar of South Clevedon ; Rector of Camerton, Somerset.

Leonard, Rev. Arthur Allen, M.A., Missioner of the Society of St. Andrew, in the diocese of Salisbury ; Vicar of Beaminster, Dorset.

Moore, Rev. J. H., Honorary Canon of Truro ; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Truro.

Newberry, Rev. John Hunt, Vicar of St. Mark's, Newtown, Pemberton.

Norris, Rev. William Foxley, M.A., Rector of Witney, Oxon; Honory Canon in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford.

Paul, Rev. Frederick William, M.A., Chaplain to the Notts County Lunatic Asylum.

Philpott, Rev. Octavius, M.A., Licensed Public Preacher in the diocese of Southwell.

Reid, Rev. J. W., Rector of Christ Church, Glasgow ; Dean of the diocese of Glasgow and Galloway.

St. Aubyn, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Stoke Damerel, Devonport ; Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral.

Sherman, Rev. C. P., A.K.C., Curate of St. Paul's, Newcastle-on-Tyne ; Rector of St. John's, Lee, Hexham.

Store, Rev. Joseph, Curate of Oaksey ; Vicar of Sevenhampton, near Cheltenham.

Squibb, Rev. Arthur, Rector of Clothall, Herts.

Thompson, Rev. James Denton, M.A., Vicar of St. Leonard's, Bootle ; Vicar of St. Helens, Lancashire.

Tregenna, Rev. C., M.A., Rector of Kirkley, Suffolk.

Whitney, Rev. J. P., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Scarborough ; Rector of Hempstead, Norfolk.

Wilford, Rev. Robert C., M.A., Vicar of Birchencliffe, Huddersfield ; Rector of Garforth, near Leeds.

Wilkinson, Rev. S., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Warrington ; Vicar of Timperley, Cheshire.

Wilson, Rev. J. Skinner, B.A., Incumbent of St. George's, Edinburgh ; Synod Clerk of the Diocese, and Canon of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh.

Worlledge, Rev. A. J., M.A., Chancellor and Canon Residentiary of Truro Cathedral ; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Truro.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cruickshank, Rev. Edward Robert, Vicar of Midhurst, at Brigton, on the 5th inst., aged 50.

Ellis-Viner, Rev. Montagu, Priest, of Keble College, Oxford, and the Universities Mission to Central Africa, at Mozambique, on the 5th ult., aged 35.

Hawes, Rev. Langdon, Vicar of Bredhurst, Kent, on the 1st inst.

Holmes, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon Cathedral, at 18, Park-parade, Harrogate, on the 9th inst., aged 74.

Kenyon, Rev. Charles Orlando, Vicar of Moreton, Oswestry, on the 6th inst., aged 74.

Payne, Rev. Richard, Canon of the Cathedral Church of Sarum, at Adderbury, on the 8th inst., aged 80.

Tayler, Rev. George Wood Henry, late Vicar of Holy Trinity, Carlisle, at 52, Chaucer-road, Bedford, on the 5th inst., aged 59.

Whitbread, Rev. Edmund Salter, M.A., J.P., for fifty-seven years Rector of the parishes of Strumpshaw and Bradestone, in Norfolk, at Strumpshaw, on the 5th inst., aged 86.

INTERESTING TO CRICKETERS.

MR. W. GUNN, the celebrated Nottingham professional, writing from the County Cricket Warehouse, 14, Carrington-street, Nottingham, 9th July, says :—"You will be glad to hear that the Electropathic Belt I had from you has quite cured the rheumatism that prevented me from playing football last winter ; and it has also been of great benefit in sustaining strength of nerve and endurance, which qualities are both of great importance to cricketers. The marvellous curative properties of this genuine Electric Belt are now well known. It gives wonderful support to the spine and internal organs of the body, is light and comfortable to wear, and may be relied upon to speedily invigorate the most debilitated constitution."

Descriptive illustrated pamphlet, book of testimonials, and consultation free, either personally or by letter, on application to the Medical Battery Company, Limited, 52, Oxford-st., London, W. (the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.)

WHAT ARE HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELTS ?

"A Boon to Sufferers."

They are genuine curative Electric Belts, constructed upon the principle of the dry pile. They require no moisture other than that of the skin to put them in action, the contact with the body being quite sufficient for medical purposes. They comprise the perfection of the methods adopted by the celebrated Professor A. Humboldt and Dr. Burg, etc., and in every case where doctors usually prescribe a course of hydropathy, one of Harness' Electropathic Belts may be substituted with advantage. Acting, as they do, upon all the most important organs of the body, they rarely fail to alleviate most of the disorders resulting from local or general debility, impaired digestion, weak circulation, or defective organic action.

THESE GENUINE ELECTRIC BELTS

are exceedingly comfortable to wear, give wonderful support and vitality to the internal organs of the body, improve the figure, prevent chills, impart new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulate the organic action, promote the circulation, assist digestion, and promptly renew that vital energy the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Their healing properties are multifarious. They stimulate the functions of various organs, increase their secretions, give tone to muscle and nerves, relax morbid contractions, improve nutrition, and

RENEW EXHAUSTED NERVE FORCE.

Acting directly on the system, they sustain and assist its various functions, and thus promote the health and vigour of the entire frame.

Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELTS

have stood the test of nearly twenty-five years, have restored thousands of sufferers to health and vigour, are guaranteed to be perfectly genuine, and are constructed on sound scientific principles. The Medical Battery Company (Limited) are the Sole Proprietors and Manufacturers of these now world-famed Curative Appliances ; and, should any of our readers still have the least doubt as to their bonâ-fide character, they are invited to call without delay at the Company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street (at the corner of Rathbone-place), London, W., where they can see the Belts scientifically tested, and can personally examine the thousands of unsolicited testimonials and Press reports that have been received from all parts of the world.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE JUDGMENT OF JESUS.

By the Rev. SINCLAIR CAROLIN, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Denmark Hill.

Sermon Preached in St. Matthew's.

"Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's."—Matt. xxii. 21

THE incident related in the Gospel for to-day occurred, as you remember, on the Tuesday preceding our Blessed Lord's betrayal and crucifixion. Ever since His triumphal entry into Jerusalem on the day but one before, the chief priests and Pharisees had been in a condition of impotent rage at the growing interest and attachment which Jesus was exciting in the people. The recent miracle of the raising of Lazarus, surpassing as it did all other miracles of our Lord in the astonishing character of its details, had been quickly and widely made known throughout the district bordering on Jerusalem; and when our Lord approached the city it was not long before He was surrounded and accompanied by an eager and expectant crowd, whose hearts beat high within them as the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God for all the mighty works that they had seen, saying, "Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord: peace in heaven and glory in the highest! Little wonder indeed was it that the Pharisees should say among themselves, "Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold the world is gone after him." This, as I have already said, was on the first day of the week, two days before the occurrence of the incidents which I read to you just now. In the interval there had occurred much to stimulate the already fierce animosity of the sacerdotal party against Jesus. While still on the triumphal progress towards the city, certain of the Pharisees had approached Him, saying, "Master, rebuke Thy disciples." They were dismissed with the calm reply, "I tell you that if these should hold their peace the stones would immediately cry out." Again roused to open remonstrance by the oft-repeated cries of "Hosanna," caught up by the little children even within the walls of the Temple, they say unto Him, "Hearest Thou what these say?" And Jesus answered them, "Yea; have ye never read, 'Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise.'" On the day following, the second day of the week, the sacred precincts of the Temple were again invaded by the hated Nazarene. "Jesus went into the Temple of God and cast out all them that sold and bought, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold doves, saying, "Is it not written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves." Here again was a further aggravation of His manifold offences against the prejudices of priest and Pharisee, and, accordingly, again the priests and scribes and the chief of the people seek to destroy Him; but, as we learn from St. Luke, are not able to devise the means, for all the people are very attentive to hear Him. And once more, for a third time, the Prophet of Galilee beards them in their sacred place. He comes early on the morning of the third day, once again to the Temple, and there begins to teach and preach the Gospel to the people as had been His wont. Now, however, His enemies lose no time in encountering Him. No sooner is He at His work than the chief priests and the scribes with the elders come upon Him with the challenge, "Tell us by what authority doest thou these things? (meaning particularly the clearing of the Temple), or who is he that gave thee this authority?" I need not remind you how effectually Jesus put them to silence, by propounding to them a question (relating to the authenticity of John the Baptist's mission), the answering of which would have involved them either in the admission of their own hardhearted unbelief or else in an open breach with the populace. Our Lord follows up the advantage thus gained by uttering three parables, in which He draws a vivid picture of the punishment that awaits their stubborn impenitence and pride. "And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard His parables, they perceived that He spake *of them*, and they sought to lay hands on Him, because they knew that He had spoken these parables against them, but they feared the people; wherefore they left Him and went their way." This retreat, however, so far was it from signifying a sense of their final defeat on the part of the Pharisees, proved to be a manœuvre undertaken solely for the purpose of planning a new mode of attack. No great length of time had elapsed before a knot of men approached our Lord, evidently engaged in the discussion of some deeply interesting question as they advanced. They proved to be a *mixed party* of Pharisees and Herodians, eagerly debating the point whether it were lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not. The Pharisees argued from the passage in xviith Deut.: "One from among *thy brethren* shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee," that it was *not* lawful to give tribute to Cæsar. The Herodians held the contrary opinion, and maintained the propriety of yielding obedience and tribute to the Roman government. Approaching our Lord, the two contending parties apparently agree to refer the point at issue to His superior and unbiassed judgment. "Master, we

know that Thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest Thou for any man; for Thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us, therefore, what thinkest Thou? Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?"

Blind wretches! how little could they have known of Christ to suppose that they could deceive Him with their miserable flattery—Him, who needed not that any should testify of man, seeing that He knew what was in man. No sooner have they spoken than He perceives that their intent is to to entangle Him in His talk, and proceeding without a moment's delay or hesitation to *unmask* them, He cries, "Why tempt ye Me, ye hypocrites? Show Me the tribute money. And they brought unto Him a penny. And He saith unto them, Whose image and superscription is this? They say unto Him, Cæsar's. Then saith He unto them, Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's." "Why," says Christ, "Come to Me, with such a question as this?" Am I not weary of telling you that My mission is not a political mission, that My concern is not with the Jewish people and their relations with foreign and rival nationalities, but with each individual soul and its relations with its heavenly Father. True, I am your long promised Messiah, the inaugurator of the covenant; but the kingdom which I have come to found is no earthly kingdom of external grandeur, it is the *Kingdom of God within the heart of man.* I have told you often and now I tell you once again: the Kingdom of God is within you. My chief care, my deepest concern, is to ensure the loyalty of the individual soul to its heavenly King, to establish beyond all possibility of disturbance the supremacy of God over the wills of His human subjects. Compared with this vast aim, how trifling, how insignificant appears your idle discussion about the payment of tribute-money. That discussion you have *practically closed* when you consented to accept the currency issued by the Roman emperor. Sedition itself cannot dispute the justice of the principle: Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. It has but to be stated in this form, in order to be admitted and allowed on all hands. But I tell you that while you are disputing about a point of political right, you are wholly careless and forgetful of your highest duty, the duty of rendering His own unto God. This coin, bearing Cæsar's image and Cæsar's inscription, is rightfully and duly given back in tribute; but *you* created in the likeness and image of God, bearing his stamp and character upon you, seem quite forgetful of the obligation you are under to render up yourselves to Him Whose mintage you boast yourselves to be. Yet this is a duty which is paramount to all others, a duty arising from the universally accepted principle of rendering to all their dues. Instead therefore of wasting your time in the discussion of idle impracticable questions, or of questions which circumstances have already, as in the present instance, decided for you, *awake to the sense of your* obligations to your heavenly Father. You are *His* by creation, you carry in you the similitude of God. Render, therefore, to God His dues; give back to Him what are His by right of creation—yourselves, body, soul, and spirit." Brethren, the words of Christ: Render unto God the things that are God's, like all the other words of His which have been recorded for our learning, have a scope and a significance far beyond the immediate occasion of their utterance. They speak to us to-day as cogently as they fell upon the ears of the Pharisees in the Temple. Every man and woman born into this world carries the image and superscription of God, however defaced and obliterated. To us has been vouchsafed the privilege of a renewal of the superscription at our baptism, wherein we were publicly signed and marked as God's workmanship—not a renewal of the image, for this latter process is a subsequent and lengthy one, and is effected by God's sanctifying grace. The renewal of God's image in us is a process which cannot go on without the consent and co-operation of our own selves. God's grace works *in* us and *with* us, but not *without* us. It is no irresistible force, compelling the human will into conformity with the Divine; it is a gentle influence, growing indeed more and more daily in constraining power, where its motions are heeded and obeyed, but yet checked and enfeebled by the opposition of the human will. Brethren, this process of the deepening and renewing of God's image—this process, or else the opposite process of stamping in the character of Satan, is going on within each individual soul here to-day. Remember, I pray you, that it is a work in which your co-operation is indispensable. Whether it be the similitude of God or the similitude of Satan that is to be graved upon your hearts, the work must be carried on with your consent and with your aid. It rests with you, and with you entirely, whether you are to bear within you the mark and stamp of God, or the mark and stamp of the Evil One. If it is your will that God's faded image should be brought out once more in clearer lines upon you, then call humbly and earnestly to the great engraver of that image, to God, to give you His holy spirit, and when it comes in answer to your call, submit yourself to its renewing recreative power, take it and hold it with all the tenacity you are master of, remembering how many and how powerful are the causes which tend towards the marring and effacement of it.

THE *Oxford Journal* states that Mr. H. Barnett, of Glympton Park, Woodstock, has been elected by a large majority to represent the diocese of Oxford, in succession to the Earl of Jersey, in the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

By the Rev. G. R. EKINS, C.M.S.

Sermon Preached at Christ Church, Rotherhithe, on Sunday Evening, October 26th.*

"And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and the breaking of bread, and in prayers."—Acts ii. 42.

THE Christian Church in our day has grown and flourished to such an extent that any light thrown on its early organisation and teaching, and modes of worship cannot but be interesting to us who now are treading where the saints have trod before. No book of the New Testament can better supply this light than that from which our text is taken, the Book of the Acts, or doings of the Apostles. It forms the first Missionary record and report of evangelistic work under the Christian dispensation, and as such should be read and re-read with glowing interest. Alas that so many read without having their ears opened, or their minds prepared to take in the glad messages which lie enshrined in its deathless pages.

Brethren, to-night we are standing on the rapidly completing pinnacles of the Temple of our God, a Temple of burnished stones, hewn by the hand of the Great Master Builder, from many an unshapely mass; and as our eye wanders over the edifice, and takes in its courtly proportions, we see the foundations resting on the solid rock of God's covenant. We can discern the great corner-stone—the stone rejected by the builders of Israel's chosen race—binding and cementing the whole fabric, for that corner-stone is Christ; and then as we glance upward, line upon line, tier upon tier, rises the Temple of our God, built of priceless stones, souls ransomed and redeemed out of every land, through the precious blood of God's own Son. When the building was small and of no reputation, materials for its structure were supplied by the seed of Abraham's chosen race; and as its proportions arose, Asia Minor sent its goodly marbles, and Greece and Italy their costliest lives; but still it grew, and new materials were added; polished shafts came from Southern Europe, and many a stately cedar from its northern bounds; and as the ages rolled along the work of God's builders, often delayed, it is true, by internecine strife, is now to-day being vigorously pushed forward, and Africa, long neglected, sends, and thank God is daily sending, dusky diamonds to ornament the gracious work of that spiritual Temple. China and Japan too find their place; stones from North and South America are there, South Sea cannibals, whose lives and doings made our grandfathers shudder, are now polished upper stones in the finishing courses of that edifice whose Builder and Framer is God. Truly the work and labour are great, but do the toilers linger? Oh no, stones, finishing stones of marble and costly granite are needed, and so God's agents go forth to gather them in, and the builders ply their busy task, for the supply is increasing, and God's house, the spiritual temple of the new Jerusalem, will soon be finished; and then indeed shall its stones sing, and its courts re-echo the glad Hosannahs of the redeemed, as with undying choruses they sing the new song, the song of Moses and the Lamb.

Brethren, does the picture speak to us to-night. Is every soul here a chosen stone in that grand Temple, or are you to be "but as rubbish cast into the void when God has made the pile complete"? Oh, in vain do you seek to gather in materials from other lands if your own soul is in jeopardy, or while the chief corner-stone is to you a *stone of stumbling* and rock of offence. Surrender yourselves to God this night, and then angels of heaven will rejoice with glad anthems of praise over lively stones which are being built up into the spiritual house of God's eternal mansion, for you will then be no longer "a stranger and a foreigner, but a fellow-citizen with the saints, and of the household of God, and built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into an holy Temple in the Lord, in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the spirit"; continuing by His blessed help, stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread and in the prayers.

The words of the text just quoted give us, as they are evidently intended to give us, a picture of life in the early Church, when to be a Christian meant far more than it does now. Filled by the Pentecostal Spirit the Apostles had preached in Jerusalem with such wondrous success that 3,000 souls were baptised and added to the Church in one day. Obedient to the Lord's command the Apostles had to go far away unto the Gentiles, but the little flock, left only under the episcopal supervision of St. James, remained faithful to their convictions, and their faithfulness brought upon them fulness of blessing, for God daily added saved souls to their number. How it must have cheered the absent Apostle, St. Peter, to hear such tidings of "faithful continuance in one stay" on the part of those converts brought to God by his preaching; *how often*, amid those stirring scenes of his after life, his soul must have been fortified, and his devotion strengthened by such a record as is preserved to us in our text to-night. We can quite imagine how St. Peter would praise and magnify God for such signal proofs of stedfastness; and, brethren, no less true is it now. When we who have ministered to you in holy things have to part with you—whether that parting be by the hand of death, or by a call to distant service,

* This sermon was preached before his leaving with his wife (daughter of the Vicar, Rev. H. C. Mitchinson) for Missionary work in the Punjaub.

how if we could hear of you, our friends, that though absent from each other, yet you who are left behind "continue stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship." Oh, if you good people here to-night only knew, as I know since I came among you, even a few short weeks ago, the prayers that go up daily to God for you by him who is your pastor and spiritual adviser, you would, I am sure, strengthen his hands even more than you do in all good works. For nothing, I am sure, would he thank God more than if concerning you the recording angel would write, that when he is absent from you, you continued steadfastly in that good way wherein so long he has been labouring to lead you. And for myself, and for her who goes with me, what shall I say? God knows that it is the prayer of our hearts that when we are far from you we may be cheered at times by tidings such as these. "They are continuing stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in the prayers." *Farewells* must be said. Oh how parting would be sweetened if we knew that some word said to-night might linger in the soul of some hearer, and lead him or her, ere they leave this building, to cast in their lot with God's own people, and be henceforth "not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of holy deeds."

If we look a little closer into the picture brought before us in the text, we shall be able to discern certain characteristics of these early Christians which may help us still more; but before leaving the text to dwell on these characteristics, I wish very briefly to direct your attention to one or two words in the text itself. The first is *their attitude*. Continued stedfastly, I cannot emphasise the word *stedfastly* too strongly. It was a glorious thing to continue in the Apostles' doctrine, but to continue stedfastly seemed almost a record too high for human power. But what man has done, man can do. And if poor human beings in the infant days of the Church could thus grace their faith, surely it is not impossible for you and me to do so now. Oh, brethren, what a conclusion to our life's history if some scribe should record of us that we continued stedfastly in the good way. Amid all the restless upheavings of this age it is hard to do so. Advertising competitors, who take upon themselves powers unknown to the early Church, trouble us with novel doctrines, and methods strange to Apostolic times. Word charmers try to woo the souls of men by garbling the message of God's love in the slang phraseology of modern witticisms. Men's minds are confused by the Babel sounds of fanatical and canting teachers, each one crying, "This is the way, walk ye in it." Amid such turmoil, how can the weary soul, seeking the foot of the Cross, find rest? The penitent thief only found the Saviour when the world below the Cross had got tired of its mockery, and their derisive cries had ceased to dull the ear. And so it will be now; but yet, if in spite of all, we continue stedfastly treading the old paths, not heeding seducing spirits, or allowing ourselves to be blown about with every wind of doctrine, we too shall have the reward of the blessed, for the very God of peace, who loveth not change, will sanctify you wholly and preserve you blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But, again, it was not enough to continue stedfastly in doctrine. Doctrine must be evidenced in things easy to see, and so two great principles of Christian conduct are brought forward, 1, The breaking of bread; and then, 2, In the prayers. The first refers of course to that feast of Love Divine, called the Lord's Supper, and a true test indeed it is of Christian uprightness, and nearness of life to God.

Papal superstition had destroyed the blessed effect of true communion with our God in the broken bread and poured out wine; but no Christian nowadays can complain that frequent opportunities are not given him of their evidencing his life in God, and obtaining at the same time nourishing food for his soul.

If the natural body must have food sufficient to sustain it in health, so must the spiritual body frequently be fed, or it will die for want of sustenance; and yet how sad to say that time after time people who have been confirmed, and who are desirous of being known as the Lord's disciples, wilfully turn their backs on His Holy Table, and refuse by their action so sit down and feast with Him. Do such really ever think of what they are doing—slighting the royal invitation, disregarding the royal command, and starving their own souls? Oh, brethren, you who love the Lord, come join with us to-night as in lowly reverence we assemble round His board, many of us for the last time together. Look, He waiteth to be gracious unto you. Yet He is anxious to bless your souls with the sweetness of His love, and oh, may some make a new start in this. I believe there are Christians here, who, thank God, are stedfast in their devotion to Apostolic doctrine, but who fall far short in this the most important part of all, the frequent communion of the Body and the Blood of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

But even here the inspired picture stops not short. Something else is added. They continued stedfastly in the prayers. "The word *the*, which is in the original Greek, but not preserved in our English version, is very significant. What were the prayers? They could not be mere private devotion in the closet, such would be simply prayer. Neither can it mean extemporaneous utterances in public worship, but it refers, or at least points out, I think, to a fitly drawn up liturgical form of worship. The prayers the well-known prayers, the petitions with which all are acquainted with, and which all know. Hallowed words of holy rites, modelled probably on the grand psalms of David, or the Levitical offices used daily in the Temple. No

other meaning can, I imagine, be placed on these words ; they show us, then, that in public worship, these Apostolic Christians did not despise *set* forms of prayer, based upon those, such as the blessed Saviour Himself used as He worshipped God in His holy Temple. And here again, brethren, there is a lesson for us. If these early followers of the Lamb were diligent in the prayers, how much too should we. Oh, the shame of empty churches, and crowded homes on the Lord's Day at least. In vain are the people called to prayer; the religious laziness of the age has infected them, and a lolling, idle Sabbath is more to them than the worship of God in houses dedicated to His praise.

I have no hesitation in saying, from my own observation of Sunday morning worship in South London, that all our parishes need a stirring up on this point, and I do not exempt this parish either from blame. Surely 11 o'clock is not too early to meet together to worship God. And yet how many are conspicuous by their absence. Brethren, let there be a change for the better. In Peshawar, where we go to, we meet for worship as early as 6 o'clock in the morning. Why? Well I believe one reason is, because the Church there is still young and vigorous, and we know the blessedness of devoting the opening hours to God in praise and prayer. Would that I could tell them of like habits here in Rotherhithe, of congregations met for worship in order to keep holy the Sabbath day by continuing stedfastly in the prayers. May this, brethren, be your attitude, faithfulness to the Church of your forefathers, and loyalty to that form of worshi pwhich has come down to us from Apostolic times.

Let me now ask your attention to the life of the early Church, as portrayed to us in the verses immediately following the text, and resulting from this continuance in Apostolic discipline.

And the first is evident from the 43rd verse : "Fear came upon every soul, and many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles." It was then a Life of Power.

It was the fulfilling of the Saviour's promise—"Ye shall receive power." In St. John xvii. one of the things there told us as given by God the Father to God the Son is power, and now this same power is handed on to the Church. Fear came upon every soul. Oh that we to-day could see the same as the result of Christian living, and walking with God ! His holy fear shadowing our footsteps.

Men nowadays have got too brave in their careless, easy-going lives, as far as God's terrors are concerned. Sagaciously they smile and say, "Where is the proof of His coming" ? Oh if we would convince them not by words, but by our lives, let us strive after this life of power, which the Lord Jesus is ready to bestow on us ; *power* to live better lives day by day, *power* to witness for Him in the midst of this ungodly world ; *and power* if needs be to lay down our lives in defence of the truth.

Brethren, we who go forth from your midst this week need to be thus clothed by the power of the Spirit. Unless we have this power we had better remain at home, and unless you possess this power too you had much better not aid in sending us.

God's power is waiting ready to be exercised, ready to be poured out upon us if we only ask Him for it, and I believe its lack is due only to the individual coldness and deadness of our lives. The church languishes in South London for want of this power in the hearts and lives of God's people. Missionary work, the evidence of the Church life, is but feebly and spasmodically supported for lack of this power among us. Individual work for Christ in our souls is withering for want of this power to energise us, and our spiritual growth becomes dwarfish and stunted for lack of this power to enable us to grow into the fulness of the stature of the perfect man in Christ. Oh, brethren, let there be a shaking among the dry bones of our religious belief to-night, and may a new man, new life, new desires spring forth out of the sepulchre, a life of power and of love, and of holiness, which will bring glory to the Head that was once crowned with thorns for us.

But in the 44th and 45th verses something further is told us of this life in the early Church resulting from steady continuance in Apostolic order : "And all that believed were together and had all things in common, and sold their possessions, and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need." Here we can plainly see evidence, I think, of a life of self-denial.

Our Christianity does not count for much, unless it teaches us to practise self-denial. How many of us do so? How many of us here really know the blessedness of denying ourselves, in order that we may do good to others ? The deepest footmarks left behind by our Lord Jesus were those when, in self-denying love, He went forth to relieve human misery, and human wretchedness, and human woe. What fields are open to us for the exercise of this gift of gifts. For heaven's choicest gift it surely is. What masses of poor around us to be relieved. What depths of sorrow to be filled up with the milk of human kindness. What calls for pity and for aid are continually sounding in our ears. What charities and hospitals are languishing for want of that ready sympathy in practical form, which can only come from a heart surcharged with divine love. What parish schemes for doing good never see the light, because the vicar cannot rely upon his people for ready help and willingness to serve. What empty churches disgrace our land, because our people are too indolent and selfish to come and worship God. What heart-burning might be healed by a little self-denial on our part. What joy might be brought to many a London tenement if God's people were not so bound up in

self and self-seeking. How many clergymen are almost broken-hearted and poverty stricken because their people will not give ungrudgingly of their substance to aid them in their warfare. How many tear-stained eyes would be dried if a little of that "quality of mercy which is not strained, but droppeth as the gentle dew from heaven upon the place beneath," were only exercised. How many broken heavy-laden hearts, would be cheered and strengthened. How many suicides' graves would be untenanted if men would only copy the example of that Perfect Man, who denied Himself of all the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and became a slave in order to redeem us from the curse and tyranny of sin.

How much of true Missionary effort is lost because the Church nowadays is not self-denying enough to give up the best of her sons and daughters for this glorious work of carrying the Gospel into other lands. How many parents are so utterly selfish as to keep back their sons and daughters from willingly offering themselves unto the Lord. How many people are so stingy, and selfish that they readily spend hundreds in carnal, and too often sinful pleasures, and give nothing, or at most very little, in order that the Church may send out men willing to go. And, brethren, to touch on sorrower and sadder themes, how many lonely graves dot the distant stations of our society missions—graves of noble men and women of whom the world was not worthy, and who died at their post simply because of the niggardliness of so-called Christian folk at home who withheld from them the ordinary supplies to sustain life. How many yearning souls, in heathen darkness, cried for the light, and often with no language but a cry, and we at home stopped our ears, and in selfish indulgence dulled our sense of duty.

Surely, brethren, against us as a Church, against us as a nation abundantly blessed by God, against us as individuals, "our brother's blood crieth unto us out of the ground" because of our luke-warmness, and lack of self-denying effort. Oh, if you have been thus wanting in times past, in God's name to-night shake off your lethargy, hug your fancies no more, control your selfish desires, lift up your eyes to heaven, and ask that self-denying power may be poured out abundantly upon you. Realise, as you breathe your sighs of sorrow to heaven, the words of the Saviour in the poet's fancy as he sings :

"Oh let thy life be given
Thy years for me be spent,
World fetters all be riven
And joy with suffering blent.
I gave myself for thee,
Give thou thyself to me."

The third characteristic of life in the early Church occurs in the next verse, the 46th : "And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." Here surely we have evidence of a life of service and gladness. Service first, and then gladness and rejoicing. How true this is in the experience of those who work for God. It is the only service which brings sweet reward at the last. His alone is the service which is perfect freedom, for it is the service of willing hearts who have given themselves to Him?

I wish you to notice how the early Christians spent their day in devoting a part of it to daily worship in the temple. Remember that the temple at this time was served by evil priests, men whose hands were stained with the Saviour's blood, and yet His followers accepted their ministration, and joined daily in the temple hymn of praise. What a lesson for many of us is here. How many of us would really come to daily service in God's house now? How many of us consecrate a portion of the day by prayer even privately to Him.

And yet further the verse is an inspired answer to those critics who lazily say, "Why meet in common to worship God at all; I can do it at home?" And yet more. How many people wilfully stay away from Church, because, as they say, so and so, the vicar or curate is not in my opinion a good man, forgetting as they murmur their excuses even the words of our 26th Article which teach us, "Although in the visible Church, the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and Sacraments. Yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry both in hearing the word of God and in receiving of the Sacraments." Believe me, brethren, nothing tends more to domestic happiness and gladness in this life than the spending of a portion of it in daily service for God. We cannot all preach sermons, but we can all undertake some little act of kindness, some little deed of love, which will hallow and sanctify the toil some labours of the day. Opportunities sought for will arise, and even they who only stand and wait, patiently abiding the Master's will, are by their very patience serving Him. To others the call for service in far away lands comes with such unmistakable clearness, that to stay away would be a sin. And oh what gladness their service brings! Only those who work for Him can know why its very trials have joys, and its cloud of sorrows is bursting with blessing. Who here to-night is willing to join us in this grand work of service in other lands? Who here to-night will come forward and say with all humility, "Lord, here I am; send me, send me"?

Oh, young men, to-night God calls you to service. He wants the world won for His Son. The fields are whitening unto harvest. Who will join the reapers, and share in the glories of the final harvest home? We who go can hold out no offer of

wealth, or fame or fortune. We can only promise for the fulness of the blessing of God resting upon you, as you toil for Him perhaps in the heavy burden and heat of the day; but we can promise you what earth cannot give. The Saviour's peace, shedding its shadow upon your life; and we point you to the final rest of heaven and the Saviour's tones, when all toil shall be overpast, saying, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Lastly, brethren, from this passage we gather that the life of the early Church was a "Life of Progress." "And the Lord added to the Church daily such as were being saved." Their daily life of power, of self-denial, of gladness of service, brought with it reward, even in this life. Souls outside the fold took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus and were added by God to the Church daily. It was not the Apostles' preaching alone that convinced them, but the earnest lives of those numbered amongst Christ's followers spoke louder than words, and thus attracted outsiders to the Saviour's Cross for salvation from sin. God added them. Think of this, my friends; is every one here a unit in God's addition sum?

We may count brilliant attendances at our services, but God counts many an empty Church where man reckons it by hundreds; and in vain do we swell the number of worshippers unless we are already counted among those whom God has added to the Church. But for those of us who toil far away in stranger scenes, and among men of an alien tongue, the lesson of progress comes with more inspiring force. It is not oratory or sensational preaching, or cunning arguments, which will draw men now to Christ and the Church, but it is the simple lifting up of Himself in all His beautiful simplicity as the world's refuge from sin, whether that lifting up be in faithful preaching, or, as it more frequently happens, by the silent life of Christian loveliness lived among those who honour Him not. Instances have been known of Missionaries abroad who never publicly preached Christ in street or bazaar, and yet who were blessed by God in seeing hundreds of souls brought to the Saviour. Their life of love was the power of God manifested in a way easy to be understood, and this thought encourages us who go from among you this week. We may not have the tongue of the ready speaker, but we know that if we try faithfully to live among men, as Jesus our Master did, we shall exhibit His life in our lives, and men must be attracted by that. The power of that same "Life of Lives" still tells with the same force on the brutal African or cultured Brahman, on the intellectual Chinee, or the domineering Mohammedan, both of whom ignore other faiths as not worth thinking about. The same power which drew Matthew from his money bags, or St. Peter from his nets, and Saul of Tarsus from his studies, and St. John from his father's side, can draw men now.

The old, old story has a freshness and a vigour about it which men of the world can hardly understand, and not a day passes but weary, sin-sick souls are seeking the foot of the Cross, and finding there that rest and comfort promised them by Him who hung thereon. Daily there are being added to the Church of the Redeemed those who walk in humble ways, for whom God's great triumph is prepared, when the iron door of life opens, and the golden hinges of the gate of the heavenly city are turned, there shall go forth to meet them those who have been blessed by them and sent on before —innumerable ranks and bands recruited from earth's toilers. They shall come about us, who have by faith and patience achieved the victory. We shall behold the great congregation of the noble, gathered and garnered from all ages of the world, and from all nations on the face of the earth; but we shall also behold Him who has redeemed our souls and presided over all the days of our life, and who keeps us ever in the hollow of His hand, "for having loved His own, He will love them unto the end." In that swelling hour of triumph He puts the crown upon our head. The crown which we will cast at His feet, as the ransomed hosts of heaven raise the cry of gratitude: "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us; but unto Thy name be the glory."

Oh, brethren, may we to-night by the eye of faith look forward and see the years as they roll return their harvest of souls. Thank God that in our day we can see such progress in Missionary efforts made, such as have not been witnessed since Apostolic times; and our faith in God's word assures us that the time is not far distant, when the isles of the sea shall claim Jesus as their Lord, "and the fulness of the Gentiles shall be gathered in, and all Israel shall be saved." Oh what glory it will be to meet in heaven's temple those who through our prayers and labours have been brought home. How our soul will rejoice as we stand on the watch towers of Sion, and see the troops of the King of kings defile in steady rank through the streets of the golden city, and our voices shall be lifted up in endless hallelujahs as with angel and archangel, and all the hosts of heaven, we in one glad new song shall praise Him "who loved us and gave Himself for us," and in whose blood our sins, though scarlet, have been washed whiter than snow.

My last words from this pulpit, perhaps the last for ever, shall be to those who are not yet added to the Church: "Come with us and we will do thee good, for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel."

"And now, brethren, saved and unsaved, I commend you to God, and to the world of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

NOTICES.

communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1890.

EPISCOPAL REGISTRY OFFICE.

"DO you know of a good curate" is one of the most frequent questions addressed by one vicar to another. "Can you recommend me a curate," writes a brother clergyman; "the agencies seem powerless; I offer £140." And on the other hand, whenever a vacancy appears in *The Guardian* there are a large number of replies to it, showing that whilst the genus vicar finds it a great difficulty to run across a fellow-helper, the genus "curate" finds it equally hard to find suitable employment; and from the very fact that this unsatisfactory state of affairs is the means of supporting several very flourishing clerical agencies, it behoves the Church as a whole to take notice of and to seek as far as possible to mitigate this evil. At the present moment unless either vicar or curate happen by some fortunate circumstance to know of each other's requirements and happen moreover to feel that the other is "just what he wants," either is beset with the greatest difficulties. Several ways are open, but all of them both undignified and unsatisfactory. *The Guardian* seems the favourite refuge of both classes, and therein the chief objections lie, to our mind, in the publicity and expense entailed. If this method be not adopted, the next course open is to apply to the various clerical agencies which seem now to be on the increase. Although no doubt carried on by persons of unimpeachable character, they have nevertheless a savour of the "registry office" about them, and the high commission charged makes them both dangerous to the poor curate depending on his earnings; and to a person of very strict views, we should imagine they might be considered to be akin to Simony. Take, for instance, a young man whose vicar has recently died; a new vicar comes and he receives notice. What is he to do? He replies to one or two advertisements in *The Guardian*, and receiving no answer is finally obliged to fall back upon one of these agencies. Maybe this is the means of obtaining for him what he wants; but as soon as he is licensed he is called upon to pay from £4 4s. to £5 5s., and this is generally at a most inopportune time.

It may be suggested that he would do better to write to his bishop, but though in individual cases the bishop may take an interest in the man himself and may also happen to know of a post to suit him, it more often than not occurs that such applications are unavailing, inasmuch as their success must more or less depend upon pure chance. What then is to be done? We should strongly urge, that either for each diocese separately, or at least for the country as a whole, there should exist a register of vacant curacies and curates desirous of appointments, and that every individual desirous to be registered should first obtain the permission of his bishop thereto. Of course some small expense would be incurred, but the amount need be but small in proportion to what is generally charged. At any rate a really ecclesiastical register of this sort would, we believe, conduce to much good. Why should it be necessary for the clergy to go outside the Church to obtain appointments within the Church? Some instances of the sort we recognise as a necessary evil, but we feel at the same time that the evil should be as far as possible minimised.

LECTURE ON THE PURITAN PERIOD.

BY THE REV. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., VICAR OF S. LUKE'S, CHADDERTON, OLDHAM.

WHEN Queen Elizabeth came to the throne, the majority of the people would doubtless feel that the long-deferred hope for a settled government in Church and State was at last realised. Roughly, the people might be classed into—

I. The active Romanists.

II. The restless Nonconformists, desirous of further changes, and

III. The large body of quiet, moderate men.

The Nonconformists, whom I will call Puritans, though the name did not come into general use till later, were the extreme Calvinists, of whom some had fled beyond seas in Queen Mary's days, and had now returned, much embittered, and possibly a little desirous to wipe away the imputation of cowardice. They had many allies amongst the nobility, especially the Earl of Leicester, and for a long period they dominated the University of Oxford. Their opinions were violent and bitter in the extreme; for instance, the Bishop of Peterborough, Dr. Howland, was much reviled by them, because that in a sermon preached after the execution of Mary Queen of Scots he was not positive of her damnation. They raised exceptions also against Richard Hooker, that he doubted not that God was merciful to many of our forefathers

living in Popish superstition, and also that he prayed not before, but after his sermons.

But the Puritans had, of course, more serious grievances than these, which were urged principally by Thomas Cartwright, professor of divinity at Cambridge, and by Walter Travers, the lecturer at the Temple. Of the former, Mr. Green, in his "Short History," says: "No leader of a religious party deserves less sympathy. With the despotism of a Hildebrand he combined the cruelty of a Torquemada." He would have punished heresy with death: he expressly says so. We may hope Mr. Green is too harsh, even on so unlovable a man as Cartwright seems to have been. Men counted life very cheap in those days, and it is sometimes forgotten that Churchmen as well as Puritans were too much under the influence of the darker parts of the Old Testament.

Cartwright put forth the Puritan grievances pretty much as follows:

I. Since Scripture ought to be the *only* rule of our actions, and since many of the Church orders are not commanded in Scripture, they are therefore offensive and displeasing to God.

II. That in Scripture there must of necessity be found some particular form of ecclesiastical polity, the laws whereof admit not any kind of alteration.

III. That the Church retained many Popish rites and ceremonies.

These charges were answered by Richard Hooker, who in 1585 became Master of the Temple. He is best known by his treatise on the laws of ecclesiastical polity, consisting of eight books. In the first he discusses the nature of laws in general, handling his subject so ably that so competent a judge as Mr. Herbert Spencer, a critic not likely to be biassed in favour of any theologian, has testified to its singular excellence. In the second book, Hooker answers the plausible opinion that Scripture is the *only* rule. But the interest of this book is mainly antiquarian, for no one nowadays would refuse to admit the validity of the laws, both of nature and reason.

The third book, an answer to the assertion that Scripture must needs contain an unalterable Church polity, is, to my mind, of immense value for the admirable dissertation on the nature of the Church with which it begins. Even in days of the most violent party spirit, Hooker refused to un-Church either the Romanists or the Calvinists. To shorten Hooker's lucid arguments would be to spoil them, but the bigots on both sides in the present day may think over this one pregnant sentence: "Where professed unbelief is, there can be no visible Church of Christ; there may be where sound belief wanteth." And when Cartwright plausibly argued that because God gave laws to the Jews, much more therefore would He to the Church, Hooker, in the true missionary spirit, replied that since the Church was to be gathered from all nations it could not be under one uniform rule, which the Jews, being one nation, might be.

To the last charge, that the Church retained many Popish rites and ceremonies, Hooker, in the spirit of a philosopher as well as a divine, showed that religion, like virtue, follows the mean and avoids the extremes. With some humour, he said: "To drag men out of coal-dust into lime-dust is to whiten them, but not to cleanse them."

From the fifth book, in which he follows the same subject into detail, and which is of great value for its weighty collateral arguments, I will venture to quote his four tests for the lawfulness of ceremonies—first, that they be reasonable; secondly, that they be ancient; thirdly, that they have authority; and, fourthly, that they may be dispensed with if not suitable to the requirements of the times.

Of Hooker's great work it may truly be said that it was written, not for an age, but for all time; and yet, when we read the fascinating pages of Professor Gardiner's history, we see that there was a side to the Puritan case which Hooker did not touch. In Mr. Green's words, "Ecclesiastical order was almost at an end. Priests flung aside the surplice as superstitious; patrons presented their huntsmen and grooms to benefices, and pocketed the stipends themselves. The teaching of divinity had ceased almost entirely at the universities." That was the state of things to which the rapacity of Henry VIII. and the merely political Protestantism of the nobility had reduced the Church. Hooker and his school, able and earnest as they were, were not the men to cope with practical evils like these. Cartwright's arguments they could answer, but the Church had to wait yet another generation for the much wanted work of a practical reformer. Then at length one came, of whom history has not yet settled her final verdict—one in whom Lord Macaulay could see nothing good, and Canon Mozley nothing bad.

William Laud was born at Reading in 1573, where he was educated; and in 1589, the year after the Armada, was sent to St. John's College, Oxford, where he was probably the only man not an extreme Puritan. He had an uphill battle to fight; it was heresy, he says, to speak to him, suspicious even to salute him. But Laud was cool and patient, and, above all, he had ability. At last he got preferment through Bishop Neale, who brought him to court, where he rapidly gained influence.

One fatal mistake, however, ruined the good he honestly desired to do. His idea was, Church restoration by means of royal, rather than moral, authority; and that authority he wielded with unsparing energy. All that Laud did was well meant, but his manner was utterly despotic. The Puritans, in their contempt for all ceremony, had allowed the very fabrics of the churches to fall into utter decay. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated on tables placed in the middle of the church, which also served as hat-stands and desks, and which the Papists contemptuously termed oyster boards; the chancels were half filled with pews; services were performed in a slovenly and irreverent manner, sometimes not at all. To remedy such a deplorable state of things as this, Laud took the work of restoration in hand, and did it thoroughly. Learning also was encouraged, and learned men were promoted. Laud enriched the Oxford library with manuscripts in many languages; he endowed a professorship of Arabic, and another of Hebrew. He kept an eye on young men of promise. It was he who ordained Nicholas Ferrar and George Herbert; he promoted Jeremy Taylor and Cosin; he helped both Hale and Chillingworth. And whatever Lord Macaulay may say to belittle him, Laud had this true mark of greatness—he singled out big, and not little, men for attack. The lesser clergy loved him, and with them he was intensely popular.

Unfortunately all this was spoilt, not only by a manner both fussy and despotic, but also by the allies with whom Laud worked. Laud was known to be the friend first of the Duke of Buckingham, the best-hated man in the kingdom, and, after his assassination, of the Earl of Strafford. Under their influence Laud

became more and more despotic, utterly unable to understand that authority alone will not induce men to change their opinions, but only makes them hold them harder. Laud degenerated into a drill sergeant in a cassock. He sternly forbade the lecturers to preach ; he not only, like Queen Elizabeth, "tuned the pulpits," but almost chose the preacher's text. Thus there was no choice before the Puritans but either the straitest conformity or else flight ; and Laud's system, though not his intentions, stands condemned by the one statement, that in less than ten years over twenty thousand fled to the far West ; and the inevitable fate which befell the Archbishop is a warning of the peril of mingling politics with religion. When Charles' attempt to govern without a Parliament failed, Laud and his system were involved in the common confusion ; and the same Parliament that sent Strafford to the block sent Laud to the Tower. The pendulum, only held by force at one end of the balance, swung violently back to the other, and the shock of the recoil for the time-being brought the ecclesiastical establishment to the ground.

. . . . . .

Every great movement must be judged, as far as possible, not only by its leaders, but by its influence, for good or ill, on the rank and file. To judge it fairly, that is, we should know not only Cromwell, the Puritan politician, not only Milton, the intellectual Puritan, not only Baxter, the ecclesiastical Puritan, but also John Bunyan, the man of the people.

Bunyan was twenty-one years old in the year Charles I. was beheaded. Even as a lad he took interest in religious matters ; though he afterwards accused himself of Sabbath breaking and profane language, he was a regular church-goer, which in latter life, he thought a mere formality, quite unaware, it would seem, that the lessons he there learnt might have been in his heart as the seed growing secretly. It was in those days the custom for the farmers to gather their apprentices about them on Sunday afternoon, and teach them the catechism ; if such apprentices were none of them worse than John Bunyan, the moral standard of the seventeenth century was higher than those who talk big about modern progress will like to allow.

As Bunyan grew to be a man, religious perplexities crowded upon his mind ; he had difficulties about faith; about that high point of Calvinism, election ; he thought that the day of grace was passed, that he had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, that, like Judas, he had sold Christ. But he gained peace at last, and in 1656 he joined the Baptists, became a preacher, and next year was indicted for so doing. After the Restoration, as he would not conform, he was again in trouble ; but the judges, especially Sir Matthew Hale, were extremely lenient, and though nominally imprisoned he preached again and again, and journeyed more than once to London.

During this season of nominal imprisonment, Bunyan wrote three books ; "The Life and Death of Mr. Badman," "The Holy War," and the "Pilgrim's Progress." It is a pity the first is not better known ; in it Bunyan has painted, and painted well, a very common type of character. Mr. Badman in his youth sowed his wild oats, after the usual manner, and in middle age reformed, and became what the newspapers call eminently respectable. Bunyan knew the world, and he makes Mr. Badman sufficiently prosperous after he became respectable. He also knew human nature, for when Mr. Badman falls ill, we see exactly how, when the devil falls sick, he becomes not exactly a monk, that was not in fashion in Bunyan's day, but a penitent. Bunyan knew that such repentances are, to use his own words, "seldom of more value than the howling of a dog." Mr. Badman however gets better, but after his recovery he behaves very badly to his wife, who fell ill and died ; then at last righteous retribution overtakes him, and his second wife behaves as badly to him. At last he dies, "like a chrisom child, quietly and without fear." I cannot forbear quoting Bunyan's remarks :—"If a wicked man, if a man who has lived all his days in notorious sin, dies quietly, his quiet dying is no sign of his being saved. When God would show the greatness of his anger against sin and sinners, He saith :—'Let them alone.' This is the sorest of His judgments. I do not say that all wicked men that are molested at their death with a sense of sin and fear of hell, do therefore go to Heaven ; but I do say that there is no surer sign of a man's damnation, than to die quietly after a sinful life, than to sin and die with a heart that cannot repent. The opinion, therefore, of the common people about this kind of death is frivolous and vain." Sensible John Bunyan was quite free from the mawkish sentiment, which in the present day is miscalled charity.

The book by which Bunyan is best known, is of course, the "Pilgrim's Progress." It is Bunyan's autobiography—autobiographies are always interesting—and it is even more, it is in some sense the autobiography of every earnest man. So far as it goes, the "Pilgrim's Progress" is universally applicable. Sin, if felt at all, is felt as a burden ; and if got rid of at all, is got rid of at the Cross. Moreover, the leading idea in the book, that life is a warfare as well as a pilgrimage, is perfectly true. People who talk glibly about "being saved" would have been unintelligible to Bunyan ; he knew better, he paints perseverance as the great difficulty, and shows us Christian tempted, and sometimes falling, up to the very last. Moreover, Christian's temptations are real, they are yours and mine. Who has not tried to shirk the Hill Difficulty, like Formalist and Hypocrisy? Who has not passed through the Valley of Humiliation, probably many times? Who has not been locked up in Doubting Castle, and hardly escaped Giant Despair? Above all, who has not met Mr. Talkative, who dwelt in Prating Row, and was the son of one Saywell? Talkative is one of Bunyan's best characters ; he had Scripture at his finger ends, was well up in doctrinal subtleties, and the more drink he had in him the faster he talked ; for "all that he hath, lieth, not in his heart or his home, but in his tongue, and his religion was to make a noise about it." Who has not been caught in a net by the Flatterer, and, let us hope, been whipped by a Shining One, the more the better.

Yet, good as the "Pilgrim's Progress" is, and glad as we may well be, both of its immense popularity, and that Bunyan passed the last few years of his life unmolested, we cannot shut our eyes to its defects, defects which are characteristic of all the Puritan school, ancient and modern. Salvation to Bunyan was a personal matter and only a personal matter. The idea of a spiritual temple, of a kingdom of Christ, of a great church, is totally absent from the book. For any effect they had on Bunyan's theology, the Epistle to the Ephesians and the last two chapters of the Book of the Revelation might as well have remained unwritten. There is no allusion in the "Pilgrim's Progress" to either of the two Sacraments, to

an order of ministers, or indeed to any of what are or dinarily known as the means of grace.

Contrast the life and writings of Bunyan with the life and writings of one who was but a little younger, George Herbert. Both were good men, both thoroughly in earnest—so far they are alike. The difference is in their ideals. It seems hard to say so, but Bunyan's ideal never rises higher than :—"Flee from the wrath to come;"—George Herbert's ideal was the glory of God, and the service of the church.

Of him, Izaac Walton has given us a quaint, but charming, picture. He was of good family, and well educated, became public orator in the University of Cambridge, had, through his family, influence at Court; and gave up all to become curate, or as we should now say, vicar, of the little village of Bemberton, near Salisbury. There he lived a life of charity and humility, adorned with the flowers of scholarship and poetry. He lived among the people, taught them, ministered to them, and died amongst them. I do not mean to say, of course, that all of his order had, or could have had, his graces and excellencies; but I think the life of George Herbert is an answer to men like Lord Macaulay, who seem never so happy as when blackening the church of their forefathers. No doubt we should not choose the Stuart period, if we were selecting great ages of the English church; but no institution, secular or sacred, can fairly be judged only from the generation immediately succeeding a great upheaval. It is as unfair on the one hand to remember only the laxness and slovenliness of the Elizabethan period, and the iron hand of Archbishop Laud, passing silently over the lawlessness of the sects and the tyranny of Presbyterian divines, as it is on the other to refuse to admit the earnestness and zeal of many of the Puritan leaders. It is absurd to brand Cromwell and Milton as fanatics; it is equally absurd to refuse to see that the continuity of religious life was in the Church, even during the Commonwealth and the Restoration. Those services which Bunyan thought formalism, those sacraments and means of grace which he ignored, were doing their work, perhaps all the better for doing it quietly and silently. The Church, like Bunyan's Pilgrim, passed through the Valley of Humiliation, and, worse still, at the Restoration sojourned for a while in Vanity Fair; but even then she lived, as she still lives, in the unity of the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows :—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—I am quite at a loss to perceive that it is contradictory to say that prayer is answered, but not always as the person offering the prayer expects.

Faith, abstractedly, has very little if any meaning. If meaning be intended, it is necessary to say or to imply in what thing or person the faith is placed. The Christian has faith, or trust, in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The devotee who throws himself under the car of his idol has faith in his idol.

A short letter does not afford space to prove that it is by men's reason that they apprehend God and His spiritual things. For the proof I refer to Coleridge, whose doctrine is that men and the lower animals have understanding, while human beings have, in addition, reason; a power or faculty differing *in kind* from understanding. Coleridge would have agreed with Mr. Sandlands' friend, who thinks that the difference between the intellects of men and of brutes is a difference of degree. While I offer no proof on this subject, I may, however, ask a question :—If it is not by reason that men apprehend God, by what faculty is it?

I cordially pardon Mr. Sandlands for accusing me of quibbling; people often make this accusation when they cannot reply otherwise. But I cannot pardon Mr. Sandlands for saying that reason leads a man to drink whisky. My reason leads me to avoid it, for it agrees with neither my body nor my mind.

The letter from "A Clergyman for forty years" in last week's PULPIT is very extraordinary. It is not agreeable to find a clergyman attacking one of the services and ordinances of the Church as if he thinks it downright pernicious. Or is the letter a hoax? If it be genuine, I am glad that during the forty years (and more) that I have been a layman, it has never been my lot to sit under the writer.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

15th November, 1890.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adams, Rev. Francis J., Vicar of St. Thomas the Apostle, Derby.

Alderson, Rev. Frederick Cecil, Rector of Holdenby, Northamptonshire; Residentiary Canon in Peterborough Cathedral.

Arbuthnot, Rev. G. A. P., late Curate of Tonbridge; Vicar of Littledean, Gloucestershire.

Argles, Rev. Canon M., M.A., Dean of Peterborough.

Barnes, Rev. B. T., late Curate of St. Peter's, Cranley-gardens; Editorial Secretary to the C.E.T.S.

Barry, the Right Rev. Bishop, D.D., Canon of Windsor.

Bellman, Rev. Arthur Horatio, B.A., Rector of Gislingham, Suffolk.

Browne, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of St. Clement's, Ipswich; Vicar of Hale, Farnham.

Burr, Rev. Arthur John, M.A., Rector of Uphill, Somersetshire.

Byron, Rev. Hon. Frederick Ernest Charles, M.A., Rector of Langford.

Carlile, Rev. Wilson, Rector of Netteswell, Essex.

Cartwright, Rev. A. R., M.A., Curate; Vicar of St. John's, Clevedon.

Coates, Rev. William Howard, Senior Curate of Christ Church, Hampstead; Organising Secretary to the Church of England Sunday-school Institute.

Edwards, Rev. W. Walter, M.A., Vicar of St. Barnabas's, South Kensington ; Rector of St. Olave's, Southwark.
Fisher, Rev. Fenwick, B.A., Curate of Spofforth ; Incumbent of St. Jude's, Salterhebble, Halifax.
Griffith, Rev. Charles Edward Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Blaenavon ; Vicar of Trevethin, Monmouth.
Hedges, Rev. Arthur William, Vicar of Westerdale, Yorkshire.
Hope, Rev. Samuel, Vicar of Eastville-with-Midville.
Hunter, Rev. Henry C. F., Chaplain to the *Himalaya.*
Jones, Rev. B., Curate of Chumleigh ; Curate-in-Charge of Colebrooke, Devonshire.
Jones, Rev. Henry. B.A., Curate of Llanbyther, Carmarthenshire ; Rector of Eglwyscummin, Carmarthenshire.
Lewis, Rev. Richard D., M.A., Chaplain to the *Neptune.*
Lutley, Rev. Edward Chorley, M.A., Rector of East Lambrook, Somersetshire.
McPhee, Rev. A. M., Curate of Haltwhistle ; Vicar of North Sunderland.
Miller, Rev. A. J., M.A., Rector of Wootton ; Rural Dean of Preston First Deanery.
Minnit, Rev. Robert, M.A., Curate of St. Luke's, Preston ; Vicar of St. Luke's, Formby, Liverpool.
Mortimer, Rev. Francis Warren Parry Jones, M.A., Vicar of Seaton Carew, Stockton-on-Tees.
Mullins, Rev. Charles R., Chaplain to the *Tamar.*
Nash, Rev. William, Rural Dean of Grantham, No. 2.
Nichol, Rev. J. G. Scrymgour, Rector of Ampthill ; Chaplain to the Ampthill Workhouse.
Powell, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of Hale, Farnham ; Rector of St. Clement's, Ipswich.
Randolph, Rev. B. W., M.A., Vice-Principal ; Principal of Ely Theological College.
Rivett-Carnac, Rev. C. G., late Vicar of Tong, Shifnal ; Vicar of Thorpe, Surrey.
Roberts, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Chaplain to the *Pembroke.*
Robinson, Rev. C. J., B.A., formerly Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Wakefield ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Matthew's, Rishworth, Halifax.
Salt, Rev. C. H., Curate of Wem, Salop ; Vicar of Haresfield, Gloucestershire.
Shirwen, Rev. Canon William, M.A., Surrogate for the diocese of Carlisle.
Smith, Rev. George William, M.A., Vicar of Waterhouses, Durham.
Smith, Rev. Henry Richard Cooper, M.A., Assistant Curate of All Saints', Highgate ; Vicar of Basingstoke, Hants.
Sotherby, Rev. W. E. H., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hoxton ; Vicar of St. Barnabas's, South Kennington.
Squibbs, Rev. George Meyler, Curate-in-Charge of Totteridge ; Rector of Clothall, Herts.
Syers, Rev. Henry S., D.C.L., Vicar of Peterborough, Honorary Canon ; Rector of Barnack.
Talbot, Rev. Richard Henry, M.A., Curate of Belshford ; Rector of Reynoldston, Glamorganshire.
Tuckman, Rev. Cecil T., Curate of St. John's Anglican Church, Buenos Ayres ; Chaplain of Cordoba and Tucuman, Diocese of the Falkland Isles.
Watts, Rev. J. P., Rector of St. Peter's, Thetford ; Chaplain to the Thetford Union.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Gardiner, Rev. George G., M.A., formerly Rector of St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 11th inst., aged 85.

Gorman, Rev. T. Murray, M.A., Curate of St. Mary-the-Virgin, Oxford, at Invermore, Oxford, on the 14th inst., aged 64.

Murray, Rev. George William, M.A., late Vicar of Shrivenham, Berks, at Speen Elms, Newbury, on the 9th inst., aged 62.

Staveley, Rev. William Brown, ex-Rector of High Halden, Kent, at Havelock Villa, Tonbridge, on the the 14th inst., aged 81 years.

Thomas, Rev. Arthur Heber, son of the Rev. C. E. Thomas, Rector of Hemsworth, Yorkshire, at Ramnad, South India, on the 2nd inst., aged 28.

Thornton, Rev. Charles, M.A., formerly Vicar of Boyford, Herts, at 10, Culverden Grange, Tunbridge Wells, on the 10th inst., aged 78.

Turner, Rev. Charles, M.A., late Rector of Framingham Earl, and formerly Vicar of St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich, at 24, Marloes-road, Kensington, on the 9th inst., aged 79.

A BOOK FOR MEN AND WOMEN.

A little book of considerable interest to both men and women is published (gratis) by the Medical Battery Co., Limited, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. It is carefully compiled, and contains much valuable information on "The Remarkable Curative Action of Electricity," with a special chapter on Mr. Harness' genuine Electropathic Belt Appliances. Those who cannot call should write at once to the above address before they forget it. A copy, with book of testimonials, will be sent post free on application.

MR. MIDDLETON'S REMARKABLE CASE.

The case of Mr. George Middleton is worthy of the most careful consideration. Writing from 66, Holborn Viaduct, he explains how one of Mr. Harness' Electropathic Belts completely cured him of severe organic weakness and general debility, after the leading London physicians had failed to do him any good. In a long letter of gratitude he describes the result as "astonishing," and says that he now has "a good appetite," is "able to walk in comfort," and gets "good sleep at night." He further states that he will be glad to answer any enquiries, or do anything n his power to bring these genuine and convenient electric appliances more prominently before the notice of his suffering fellow-creatures. Thousands of similar testimonials have been received from all parts of the world and from all classes of society, copies of which are published in book form, and may be had free by post on application to the Medical Battery Company, Limited, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. Any of our readers who may be suffering from nervous exhaustion, organic weakness, physical debility, impaired vitality, melancholia, hypochondriasis, indigestion, gout, rheumatism, sciatica, lumbago, epilepsy, torpid liver, hysteria, kidney diseases, sleeplessness, loss of appetite, rupture, corpulency, &c., should not fail to call, if possible, at the Company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation. Those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call, should communicate by letter without delay, when a descriptive illustrated pamphlet and private consultation form will be sent them gratis and post free to any address. We may add that this palatial establishment is the largest and only complete electro-therapeutic in the world, and the public should avoid all fraudulent and worthless imitations. Note carefully that the Company's only address is 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), where their officers are in daily attendance from 9 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. ; Saturdays till 4 p.m.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE PURPOSE, PROBATIONAL AND SAVING, OF AFFLICTION.

By the Rev. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER, LL.D., Curate in Charge of St. Mary-le-Strand.

Sermon Preached in St. Mary-le-Strand, on Sunday Evening, June 22nd, 1890.

"For God maketh my heart soft, and the Almighty troubleth me."—Job xxiii. 16.

IF the dictates of the natural heart were allowed full autonomy in man, then moral, social, and physical, progress farewell!—then, retrogression to absolute ruin were the law of man's moral, social, and physical existence. A full obedience to the dictates of the natural heart would result in disruption of the bonds moral, social, and physical, binding together the welfare of humanity. Man's mental and material powers, his spiritual and corporeal course for good, would stand impeded, and become finally dammed up of self-wrought evil, and Satanic pollution. Then would the heart of man be unrefreshed and impure as the standing pool, whose corrupting waters are uninvigorated beneath by the sweet-welling springs of living water, and unrefreshed upon their surface by the health-breathing atmosphere of the empyrean above. Or, perhaps, I should rather liken the natural heart of man, not to water still and stagnant, but to that element frigid and frozen; to which the sluggish current underneath the ice-bound surface only affords substance for increased hardness and density, and which the chill, piercing winds impenetrating its mass only render superficially rougher, and throughout denser and more obdurate; and upon whose obdurate density the sun's gentle influence has little or no effect Like to such is the natural heart of man—cold, hard, unsympathetic, not sensitive to the fervour of holy influences divine; suchlike is that heart which the Almighty troubleth not, that heart which God maketh not soft.

"For God maketh my heart soft, and the Almighty troubleth me." We know that troubled, that is to say, moving waters are ever the sweetest and most healthful, and troubled hearts that God moves are ever the sweetest and soundest. The heart that trouble truly softens, has yielded up its emotional life a sacrifice to the grace of God; and that surrendered heart will become more and more keenly sensitive, with accruing grace, to the troubles afflicting and intended to soften, the hearts of others. This sensitiveness of sympathy gives an ennobling moral tension to the soul of the sympathiser, which frequently raises him above the prostration of his personal tribulation; whilst active sympathy, the hand of help working the relief of another, returns not empty to the bosom of its owner, but enclasps the precious balm that shall alleviate the sympathiser's own heartsore. In the incomparable depths of the Saviour's grief, His sympathy overwhelmed His sorrow; and when His pierced, outstretched hands of help tendered spiritual relief to humanity, they returned to the bosom of love of the Man of Sorrows, full of the all-absorbing, triumphant joy of reconciliation effected between His Holy Father and His sin-rescued brethren.

Our Great High Priest, self-sacrificed, being "touched with the feeling of our infirmities. . . . Who can have compassion upon the ignorant and on them that are out of the way, . . . learned obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." Perfection the Son of God acquired not by suffering, for perfect He was from all eternity; but He acquired the perfection of the power of sympathy for sinners, by suffering, as a man, as if He were a sinner; and He acquired capacity of sympathy with us, who, as sinners, have to learn under suffering the obedience of faith. Now, only by the obedience under suffering of His Manhood to the will of God could the Son of God, Whose will as Deity's, possibly be in fellowship of sympathy with us in the obedience required from our wills to God's will. And thus the Son of God, by taking unto Himself a man's nature, and a man's will, with capacity for suffering, and necessity for obedience, established His brotherhood with humanity in suffering, and compacted it in a sympathy existing in the Son of God throughout His "Eternal generation:"— suffering chosen as the vehicle for the expression of His sympathy with man, because the kinship of all humanity is closest, and most keenly felt to be real and abiding, in suffering and in sorrow. Therefore, the doctrine of Christ insists upon the duty of the sympathy of love to one another—the duty of suffering with and for one another—to be as imperative as the human kinship of trouble, the heirship of sin, is universal. Wherefore, in the case of the human nature of His Blessed Son, God made His heart soft, and the Almighty troubled Him.

By the case of the inspired writer of my text, Job, God's afflictive troubling of man is proved to be not so much punitive as probational; and purposed to create that tenderness of heart which He accepts as a pleasing sacrifice, because from it flows that sympathy of man to man, akin to Christ's sympathy, and in harmony with His law of laws, which is love. But likewise, the probational purpose of Job's affliction was to try out the natures

of his wife and three friends, in respect to their capacities for sympathy and reciprocal suffering; and they not standing the test, were apportioned, as we shall see in the sequel, to make the reparation of repentance and sacrifice. Because Job's feeling heart softened when the Almighty troubled it, he refused to yield to the advice of his presumptuous wife. "To curse God and die;" and also bore with patience the insidious and cruel upbraidings of his three fair-weather friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar. Oh!—

> "The whips and scorns of time,
> . . . . . the spurns,
> That patient merit of the unworthy takes."

Patient merit! For the softening influence of Divine grace, while it troubles the soul to its very core, strengthens the moral resolution to stand firm against the shock of Satanic persecution, even as it strengthened Job, till he stood firm as a rock, like unto the Rock Christ; and in the very abasement of his suffering, actually argued in favour of God's goodness; and Job's patient, Christ-like spirit stands up straight, although his poor agonized body bows beneath the double scourge of Satanic malignity and human scorn.

"For God maketh my heart soft, and the Almighty troubleth me." The expression that God maketh the heart soft is very significant, when it is to be understood as implying a contra-condition of hardheartedness; but, before the Almighty troubled him, a contra-condition of hardheartedness was not existent in Job; nevertheless, under the chastening hand of God, his kindly heart became even kindlier, and more and more tender, which proves that the purport of his affliction was that grace upon grace might abound, to exalt his virtues unto the perfection of holiness. In this world, however, the Jobs are in the minority; and we all know, who have lived any length of time, that the hardhearted are in the majority; and well it is for hardhearted human nature, of which there is so plentiful an abundance, that the grace of God is still more plenteously abundant—well indeed it is that God makes many of the hearts of this multitude soft, and oftentimes troubles them. But, passing by the class of those whose hearts are softened, there is a heavy residuum, sad to say, composed of persons whose hearts remain invulnerable to the softening touch Divine; who are deaf to prayer and dumb to entreaty; who are dead to feeling and defunct to sympathy; and who are to be found leagued together for evil, and partners in frowardness. In the Pilgrim's Progress, they were the inhabitants of the town of Vanity Fair; and they proved their kith and kinship with the devil, by martyring the pilgrim Faithful, and showed their hospitality by persecuting his companion, Christian, out of their gates. In the Bible, of this clan-kinship were Pharaoh the hardhearted—heart-hardened—tormentor of God's people; Jezebel, the cruel destroyer of Naboth; and Pashur, the priestly persecutor of the prophet Jeremiah. Of such sort were the New Testament trio, Herod, the slayer of the Innocents; Herodias, the murderess of John the Baptist; and Judas, the betrayer of the Lamb of God. All these are examples of the hardhearted, and very cruel were their tender mercies. Hearts of their indurate sort, when entreated, spurn; and, on their own part, spurn to entreat God's softening grace for themselves. Rocks of adamant are they to the soft-falling dews of heavenly grace: ask for grace, they will not; offered grace, they will none of. Sympathy they wot not of; for, in order to sympathise, the heart must be capable of feeling for another as it would for itself; but, if the hardhearted assume pity, and pretend to sympathise, the fiction is revealed by the fact that their kindness is not self-denying but self-interested. To sum up, in the popular phrase, they are without heart; their inclination leaning not towards the good, or the suffering, or the lowly, but gravitating undeviatingly towards the world-prosperous, no matter how unworthy of the unworthy they be, and worldly of the worldly they are. What impression can be made upon this class of human-kind? None. What impression can be made upon a rock? None; except, in the words of Job it be "graven with an iron pen, and lead in the rock for ever."

I will not place Job's three fairweather friends among the class of the hopelessly, the wilfully hardhearted; but they presented him, in lieu of consolation of word or of deed, with upbraidings and suspicions, and they endeavoured to argue the good man into false confessions of hidden guilt. That he was guilty of some dark crime secretly enacted, his harsh friends were persuaded. Their accusations, levelled at a sincerely upright man in sorrow, were not mild ones; they accused him of irreligion, hypocrisy, and of presumptuous wickedness. They challenged him to bear false witness against his own consciousness of innocence of wilful transgression. But the words of St. Paul to Timothy might be justly applied to Job: he had followed "righteousness, faith, charity, and, peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." And now under persecution, his afflicted body became a vessel of honour, his mind a haven of peace, and his soul the sanctified keepsake of his God. And to his wife, who in her folly understood not the wholeness of his rectitude with God, and who even mocked him for it—for she said, "Dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God and die"—to her he said, rebukingly, "Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What! shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil"? Magnificent example of the obedience of faith, learned through the discipline of suffering! And to his censorious friends he declared, in a voice of majestic gladness, coming from the depths of a heart that God had filled with faith and fore-

knowledge, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another." Martyrlike, while his body lay under the thrall of the enemy, his mouth out of the abundance of a softened heart, bore witness to the grand truth that his Redeemer should come in the affliction of human nature, and for human nature afflicted; and the foreknowledge that a Divine Redeemer should come in human flesh, a sufferer for and sympathiser with sinful and sorrowful humanity, sustained his vexed spirit under ordeals unrecorded for sufferings intense among the children of trouble. Prophetic fire kindled the light of hope in his sorrow-stricken heart, and warmed it to love a Redeemer to come in the meridian of time.

Let us examine what the evidence of guiltiness amounted to, on which these ill-judging men based their rash and rude verdict. The fruit of Job's lifework was good, and nearly perfect; therefore, by his fruits even appearances could not reasonably condemn him. He had been a rich man, prosperous and profuse, yet he had been humble, pious, and full of sympathy. By contract craved of Satan from God, this holy man's faith was permitted for a season to be assailed by the malignant devices of the devil. By the ruthless sword of the Sabean and the Chaldean—by the fiery javelin hurled from the contending hands of the cloud-floods—and by the the artilleried army of the cyclone—(for the Almighty permitted him to employ these destructive agencies, war, lightning, and tempest), the Great Destroyer, in his very element, destroys by and through them, the peace and prosperity of Job; bereaving him of his affectionate family, to scarify and scar his tender heart; rending from him his vast substance, to degrade him from the highest social rank to the ruck of beggary; yet, still insatiate, craving power to disease his bodily frame, and scare away the very desire and love of life itself.

Job's three friends argued from visible effects to a theory of their cause, which, to their warped, mis instructed minds, was sufficient to account for those effects; and they bent their theory to accommodate itself to his case, by supposing that since his outward life had been perfect, he must have been guilty of some great, secret offence. Their theory attributed affliction to but one cause—the avengement by Deity of great wickedness Affliction to them was the rod of punition, and nothing more—God executing vengeance upon the body of a heinous sinner. They were uninstructed in the secret of the probational administration of God's moral government, and they were ignorant that God's mildness as well as His severity is evidenced in afflictions, whether they be punitive or probational. They divided His indivisible, essential nature, One in the union of its justice with mercy, and of its mercy with justice. They had no Bible, but they had the tradition of antiquity—the half-light of human wisdom to guide them, and it partially misled them. A common opinion of the ancient world was, that afflictions were always the direct manifestation of Divine displeasure. Eliphaz, after proving traditionally the certain punishment of wicked men, pointedly aiming his remarks at Job's misfortunes, urged with regard to the wicked, "In prosperity the destroyer shall come upon him,.... and he is waited for of the sword. He wandereth abroad for bread, saying, Where is it? . . . Trouble and anguish shall make him afraid; they shall prevail against him, as a king ready to the battle."

Many of the proverbial sayings uttered by these three harsh men in their tirades against the wicked, and thrust at righteous Job, were undoubtedly not maxims of their own making, but popular axioms of that antiquity, which they relied upon as the authority for the truth of their theory that his afflictions must be the penalty of guilt. To some men the promptings of prejudice are the convictions of conscience. With Eliphaz, evil prejudices actually matured into such delusive convictions of the patriarch's guilt, having all the force, but none of the truth of fact, that he distinctly indicted him for the commission of certain specified crimes, and made the indictment after Job had declared, "Behold my witness is in heaven, and my record is on high. My friends scorn me, but mine eye poureth out tears unto God." To their traditional theory of affliction being always punitive, Job's life and arguments opposed the truth of fact. For although the mystery of Christ's Gospel of sympathy, which shows that mercy underlies suffering, was unrevealed to them, "the secret of the Lord" was with *him*, of whom the Almighty has said, that he was "one that feareth God and escheweth evil." In language exquisite for its calm yet fervid eloquence of unfaltered, unconquerable faith, he opened up the probational meaning of his afflictiion, saying, "He knoweth the way that I take; when he hath tried me I shall come forth as gold. My foot hath held His steps, His way have I kept, and not declined. Neither have I gone back from the commandment of His lips. I have esteemed the words of His mouth more than my necessary food."

I have treated of the hardhearted whose tendencies, all converge to evil, because Satan, the pointsman of evil, turns them on the downtrack of wrong that they may reach the terminus of his cruel desire, destruction. How pleasurable it is to withdraw the mind from the contemplation of these misguided ones to consider the characteristics of the soft or tender-hearted, whose hearts delight in expressing the qualities of love, gentleness, generosity, delicacy, and, in short, that consideration of and for others, whose well-spring lies fresh, pure and deep in the fount of Christian sympathy.

They are the possessors of, what I may call, moral elegance and spiritual gracefulness; and this loveliness of character can only well up in the breast that is struck by the divining rod of the Spirit of God. They who discover to us these characteristics of a softened heart, are led of the Spirit of God; and they are the sweetest companions for their fellow-men on earth, and they shall form the elect society of Godhead in heaven.

The tender-heartedness and generosity of God Himself (by which we may take pattern) was displayed when He made His servant Job whole, and gave him restitution double for all of his that Satan had destroyed. And, just and merciful even to the unmerciful and unjust, the Lord said to Eliphaz—"My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends, for ye have not spoken of Me the thing which is right, as My servant Job hath." And, then and there, He commanded these censorious, ill-judging men to offer sacrifice for their guilty hardness of heart, and to go to His servant and secure his supplications on their behalf, lest He should "deal with them after their folly." There is God's charity!—charity even to the uncharitable,—but the reward of love to him who showeth mercy; and such reward was Job's, for his happy end was the obliteration of all his former sorrows, and the outvieing of all his earlier joys. To all posterity his affliction proves that the power of faith can, to the glory of God, and to the exaltation of man, overcome the concentrated energy for evil of the Arch-enemy of all that is good—that, under God, long suffering can outweary even Satanic persecution,—that—

> To suffer meekly God's mysterious will
> Ne'er brought the sufferer to final ill:
> Traced in the script of human life I find,
> Severity Divine can *never* be unkind.

This comfort of faith forms a rainbow of hope, spanning the evanescent cloud and light-swathed sphere of human existence,—the victorious token to us of God's everlasting benevolence in and through the permission of all suffering.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1890.

THE EASTWARD POSITION.

THE recent judgment on the Bishop of Lincoln's case exhibits a singular contradiction. While it is admitted that the Eastward Position is not illegal, the liberty is somewhat curiously curtailed by the injunction laid upon the officiating minister to do nothing whereby the congregation are precluded from witnessing the manual acts of consecration. In this case, unless he faces west, or nearly so, he has no alternative left but to *elevate* the paten and chalice above his own head, if he would not violate the terms of this latest specimen of ecclesiastical tinkering, and it is well known that elevation of the elements has long been condemned by Lord Penzance's Court. From the Purchas judgment onwards, there have been some of the strangest inconsistencies and anomalies, in the decisions given on disputed points of ritual, which only make the confusion greater, the only substantial purpose served by them being that of filling the pockets of a few eminent lawyers and their subordinates. We are told that a great doctrinal issue is involved in the Eastward Position. The Low Church opponents declare that it symbolises, and therefore sanctions the doctrine of a renewed and repeated sacrifice of Christ, which is contrary to the apostolic assurance that He was offered once for all, and that His sacrificial work is complete and finished. On the other hand, unless we would be ruled by an *ex parte* statement, we are bound to accept in good faith what the supporters of the contested ceremonial observance assure us, namely, that no repetition or renewal of the sacrifice and sufferings of Calvary is intended or implied, but only a showing forth—or representation of the Lord's death, which is pleaded day by day before the Father. But after all, we are obliged to say

that we cannot see why there need be such a waste of energy and money about the question of east or west; for in the Primitive Church, where heathen temples or Basilicæ were converted into Christian places of worship, the Eastward Position was never adopted, and was in fact a practical impossibility, since there was a chasm in front of the altar, leading down into the crypt. It would certainly be a strengthening of their own hands, if the Bishop of Lincoln were to publicly remind his supporters that since it is the doctrine, and not the outward observance for which in reality they are, and have been so long contending, the cause would be much better served were they, if necessary, to cede the disputed point of ritual, and let the worshippers perceive for themselves that they value the elements, and treat them with the utmost care and reverence, not because they are in themselves of any more worth than any other bread and wine; but because through them the all-sufficient sacrifice is pleaded before God, and the merits thereof are conveyed to our souls and bodies, for the remission of our sins, and the pledge of eternal life. He has said, Do this, (offer this sacrifice), and so they will do it in remembrance of Him.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE.

(*Communicated.*)

THE long-expected judgment given by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln, has many satisfactory features. Putting aside the chief points in the controversy—the final remarks merit a word or two, as they express the opinion of many of the more tolerant of all schools—High Church, Low, or Broad.

It is no doubt very exasperating to the promoters of the case—to find themselves, and their mode of action, sternly reproved, when they had hoped the iron hand would be for their antagonist, and the silken glove for themselves—but all tolerant churchmen whatever be their grade, will be glad that expression has been given to the feeling that these "frivolous and vexatious" proceedings are not only scandalous in their occurrence at all, but most reprehensible in their mean way of spying and collecting evidence. If certain persons of a congregation disapprove of the conduct of service in the church they frequent, there is no obligation for them to attend that church. In most large towns there are many churches of various opinions, and the malcontents could be easily suited with the kind of service they approved. But that two or three malcontents should paralyse the work of an entire, and in many cases, an energetically worked parish, cause great expense at a time when every available shilling is wanted, and every hardworking clergyman—and all for a few quibbles—is rather more than preposterous.

No harder working man or better bishop ever has been appointed than Dr. King. Never sparing himself, in his diocese; travelling all over it continually, he is known and loved throughout the second largest county in England. High and Low Churchmen write in praise of "Our Bishop," and with the lower orders, he is an equal favourite. Not long ago he was preaching in a church which was requiring funds for enlarging. The vestry was small, so the clergy robed at a house in the village, and Bishop King in full canonicals came in procession to the church through a crowd of labourers and villagers. Here was a grand scope for an outburst of Protestant indignation, but the word went round the village after, "He's a real gentleman—and has put on his best things to come and see us"!

The mean and pitiful spirit which is shown by the promoters of the suit is not pleasant to dwell on, and the award of "no costs" will be a lesson to them to mind their own business in the future. They give notice of appeal to the Privy Council, but it is to be hoped in the interests of common justice, they will experience another failure in their designs for persecuting one of the best bishops ever ordained to the high office.

Reviews and Notices.

"LUX MUNDI; a Series of Studies on the Religion of the Incarnation." Eighth Edition. London: Murray. 1890.

THIS series of essays has been compared with the celebrated "Essays and Reviews," which, about thirty years ago, produced much discussion and animadversion. The plan of the present book is, however, different from that of its predecessor. The "Essays and Reviews" were discursive; *Lux Mundi* is systematic. This is apparent, not only from its substance, but also from the heading of its pages, viz., "The Religion of the Incarnation." All the twelve essays or chapters, of which it consists, may be said to be exhibitions of that central doctrine or fact of Christianity, not so much in varying lights or phases, as in relation to different bearings of the doctrine. While the several essays are by no means alike in degree of literary merit, and while some of them display much more of depth of thought and originality of illustration and idea than the rest, there runs through all a certain similarity of general thought, which is to be accounted for, probably enough, by their authorship. All of the contributors are either of Christchurch, Keble College, or the Pusey House.

The first of the essays is by Canon Scott-Holland, on "Faith;" the second, by the late Aubrey Moore, on "The Christian Doctrine of God." Then follow others on "Dogma," "The Atonement," "Inspiration," "The Church," "Sacraments," and two on ethical subjects. Since the issue of the first edition of the book, Mr. Gore, the writer of the article on "Inspiration," has published a tract, apparently meant to deprecate the weight of sundry censures on what he has advanced in his essay, and has appended to this

short dissertation on "The Christian Doctrine of Sin" We are of opinion that this publication, as also certains parts of the book itself (of which we shall presently speak), are supererogatory. There is really less to explain in Mr. Gore's article than his commentators have supposed; but by giving a turn to his language, which appreciative readers can readily perceive to be constructive and not direct, some of his critics have represented him as attempting to minimize the truth of the Old Testament Scriptures in a way inconsistent with recognition of almost any degree of authority in them. If a book or pamphlet is written in such tangled and obscure language as to require a supplement to explain it, in nineteen cases out of twenty it is not worth having written, not worth reading, and not worth explaining. Now, Mr. Gore writes very clearly. The appendix on the Doctrine of Sin is not comparable in value to the essay in the book; the subject is redundant to the compass of the intention of the book; for there is no peculiarly "Christian" doctrine of sin, Christianity assuming the existence of it as an ultimate fact of experience, whereon ethical science and intuitions rest. The Christian apprehension of the exceeding sinfulness of sin is not a doctrine, or a part of theology; it is a thing that cannot be taught, and can form no item of the volume of religious dogma. We have the same to say of the subject treated of in the third essay of the volume, "The Problem of Pain." This is not a problem to the Christian as such, but a problem in ethics. We must, however, admit, that while we regard the discussion to be unnecessary, it is treated with admirable suggestiveness, if not with originality, by its writer, Mr. Illingworth.

We place, as of the greatest in value of these essays, that by Mr. Moore, that by Mr. Moberly on Dogma, and that by Dr. Paget on Sacraments. We are glad to observe that Dr. Paget refers, as to a spiritual father, to that remarkable writer and thinker, Alexander Knox; and that he especially acknowledges his indebtedness to his works for some observations on the Holy Eucharist, which might easily pass for original with those unacquainted with Knox's writings. Respecting the two others, those by Mr. Moore and Mr. Moberly, no one could read them without profit. We should be glad to be able to say as much for Canon Scott-Holland's contribution. It is not that there is any error of statement, or anything positively exceptionable in it: but there runs through it, as appears to us, an assumption, of a nature that we regard as making a difficulty in the way of accepting revelation at all. We are fully aware that many, if not most persons, do not coincide with us; but we have for long agreed with Coleridge, that to speak of natural religion being possible, without an antecedent revealed religion is a moral contradiction and an absurdity; and that no religion that is not revealed or that is without basis in revelation, should be called a religion According to this view, *natural* religion is admissible as a term only if it be meant that what is so characterized is in accordance with nature. But if it be meant that man can construct a religion, and find out for himself, unassisted, a Supreme Being, this is not admissible; and all such so-called natural systems are but plagiarisms Now, there runs through Aubrey Moore's essay the constant assumption that God in revelation is the source of all spiritual knowledge; and through Canon Holland's, either the absence of this, or the contrary assumption, unless, indeed, we do him injustice, which we hope we do.

As a philosophical defence of dogma as such, and of Christian dogma in especial, Mr. Moberly's paper is most admirable. We could wish it more extended; and perhaps it may be eventually the foundation of an exhaustive work. One remark in it we will quote:— "We may say that the life of a professing Christian, which is not a life of growth in the apprehension of spiritual truth, must necessarily be a retrogression, just as the life of so-called scientific study, which is not continually illumina ing afresh, and deepening the certainty of its own scientific principles, must gradually come to hold even its own scientific principles less and less certainly, and to mean by them less and less." This appears to us, while the idea is not new, to be an excellent comment on the promise of our Lord, that the Spirit of Truth will guide His Church into all truth. Now, *guide* means *educate*, and while the body of revelation is final—that is, is incapable, as we believe, of being superseded—men's apprehensions of the Truth must be matter of development and progress. This is also a caution against the too prevailing temper and disposition to regard any new view of Christian doctrine, criticism of the sacred records, etc., no matter how justified by the acquisition of new knowledge as heterodox. We should not overlook, as is too common, that the promise of that Heavenly Guide to lead us does not include a promise that the pupil will always follow; while it does import, that by degrees, rapid or slow, and even in spite of times of retrogression, the Church will at last arrive at the utmost possible height of spiritual understanding.

In some of the essays, the language used concerning the Catholic Church is too idealistic, if we may so express ourselves. The Church is spoken of rather as the Church ought to be than as historically has been the case. This, however, is an error of tone rather than of statement. One error there is in Mr. Lock's article on "The Church," which we must notice. He quotes with agreement some one who, speaking of the unbroken continuity of the English Church, says: "It is an obvious historical fact that Parker was the successor of Augustine, just as clearly as Lanfranc and Becket," as if this were a statement of the Apostolical Succession. Now, the Apostolical Succession is not the succession of the bishops of a particular see, or of the patriarchs of a particular province. Define it so, and it opens the way to an incautious admission of the fallacy on which the Romish-Petrine claim is based. The real succession is the unbroken and unbreakable succession of the whole order of bishops over the whole Christian world; unbroken because unbreakable, so long as every bishop is consecrated to his office by three already so consecrated bishops; invalidity of consecration thus never perpetuating itself.

It remains to us to make a few observations on Mr. Gore's paper on "Inspiration"; the essay, which amongst these has produced by far the most hostility—an hostility not much, if at all, disarmed by his pamphlet in explanation. We differ from Mr Gore very little. We think that he too unreservedly accepts as conclusive much of the recent results of Old Testament criticism; so resembling the early geologists in their too hasty generalisations about igneous and aqueous action. We think also that he is too sanguine in his expectations of the results, both in extent and in certainty of future investigation. These, however, are not quite the points whereon any great amount of exception has been taken to Mr. Gore's views. Those points are substantially two. It is

attributed to him that he "idealizes" sacred history; and it is attributed to him that he disparages our Lord's authority as a teacher. "The first traditions of the race are all given there (*i.e.*, in Genesis) *from a special point of view.* In that point of view lies the inspiration."—8th Essay, page 344. Further, Mr. Gore speaks of parts of the Old Testament representing the Israelitish history in one light, and other parts in another light; we need not make quotations. Now, we cannot understand how this idealization—treating Chronicles as the representation of one historical idea, and the Books of the Kings as the representation of another historical idea—is susceptible of reasonable objection, or even of being contested. We suspect that many who assail Mr. Gore either have never read him, or do not understand what they have read, or think that *an idea*, because they cannot handle, taste, or smell it, is an unreal thing. Imagine an Englishman and a Frenchman, each with the most perfect qualities for writing history — the most absolute candour, and the completest acumen in discerning truth from fable, and from distortions—undertaking to write narratives of the Napoleonic wars; their narratives could not, we do not say merely would not, be the same. They would write them from the standing points of different ideas. So it is with all history, and so it must be both with the sacred and the profane. The other charge against Mr. Gore is more serious, and is almost as unfounded Our Savour's authority, it is thought, is disparaged, when it is not admitted as a matter of course that Moses was the author, or the editor at all events, of the Five Books. It is seriously said, that when our Lord spoke of Moses and the Prophets, He actually set His *imprimatur* on their attributed authorship. It is enough reply to this, that any one quoting from the play of "Pericles," and giving Shakespeare as his authority, would never think of entering on the question of its asserted spuriousness. We do not absolutely say that this applies to our Lord's citation of the 110th Psalm. It may be tenable that the argument contained in the question that silenced objectors has no meaning unless the Psalm was actually written by King David. But a more ridiculous contention there could hardly be—it is worthy of that profound biblical critic, Mr. Huxley, who, we believe, invented it—than that our Lord's reference to Jonah's resurrection makes His own resurrection questionable as matter of fact, unless the narrative of Jonah be matter of history, and not allegory.

The eleventh and twelfth of these essays, on Politics and Ethics, do not call for any special remark from us. They are not on a par, either in composition or in thought, with the rest.

We do not claim for *Lux Mundi* that its publication will mark an era in the history of English religious development; but we claim for it great interest, and we ascribe to it, on the whole, a high value.

AT the afternoon service at Exeter Cathedral on the 21st inst., Prebendary Edmonds was installed as residentiary Canon in the place of the late Treasurer Barnes, and the Rev. W. St Aubyn, of Stoke Damerel, read himself in as a prebendary.

A TESTIMONIAL, which took the form of a cheque for £300, has been presented to Dr. Momerie by some of his friends and pupils.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EFFORTS AGAINST DARKNESS, SORROW, AND SUFFERING.

SIR,—The book of General Booth seems to unfold a very comprehensive scheme to put forth vigorous efforts against the gigantic ills that surround us. He has the important advantage of wielding organised and disciplined forces, on an immense scale, with almost universal ramifications. As educated Christianity has made very little impression on the mountain loads of crime, vice and suffering, it appears to be the duty of sincere Christians to avail of the organised agencies of a rougher order, under the control of General Booth, on the lines he suggests. But I think well-known men should be appointed by those who furnish the money, in order to ensure its application in accordance with the general understanding.

I myself believe in two grand sources of healing and beneficent effects, which I do not see included in the General's programme.

The chief is the influence of Divine love on human minds and hearts. In the last sermon preached by Canon Liddon. I was struck by the following words: "All that wins for the Divine Redeemer more room in the thoughts and hearts of men." It occurred forcibly to my mind that one of my strongest objections to the old theology is, that if acquiesced in, it compels me so to think of the Redeemer as to narrow the room I wish to give Him in my heart. I am obliged to suppose that the Saviour is filled with tender anxiety for the salvation of men, so long as animal life exists within them. But as soon as it is extinct, He becomes callously, implacably indifferent, and will so remain eternally. It is my decided conviction, that such conceptions are calculated to maintain gloom, coldness, and even cruelty. It seems monstrous, that although Christians are constantly reading, "His mercy endureth for ever," many of them still assert that "His mercy" will cease at the threshold of an immortal existence. If we believe that God is the Universal Father, and that the scheme of redemption has abundant resources, to secure the permanent welfare of all intelligent creatures, and will be applied to accomplish that object, entirely and completely, our hearts will be warmed and stimulated to congenial efforts on our own part.

The other healing source of light, strength, and comfort is the maintenance of justice and benevolence towards men, inspired by right teaching as to the character and purposes of God.

I was much struck, five years ago, on seeing that writers on Political Economy acknowledge that Labour is the universal agent that produces wealth. Yet it seemed clear to me that Labour has scarcely had any share in the immense increase of wealth that is accumulating in England. In almost all the arrangements between Capital and Labour, those who work have wages regulated on the principle of supply and demand, which means that an overwhelming supply of labourers causes wages to fall. Owing to this, while wealth continues to increase, multitudes of those who are indispensable agents in producing it are often nearly starving. A very large proportion of those who live in England have no hope at all as regards this life.

It is clear to my own mind that those who labour ought to have, besides wages, a share in the increase of wealth. I am truly glad to know that the principle of "Profit Sharing" has been introduced and carried out to a considerable extent in France, and, to some extent, in England. It is, I believe, like the quality of mercy, "twice blessed; it blesses him who gives and him who takes." It implants sparks of hope, kindling into flames, in the breasts of those who work, and stimulates their energies, so that the quality of work becomes improved. There is increased vigilance and care, diminishing inferior results, losses, and accidents. I have seldom seen an account of a Spanish vessel lost at sea. The Spanish shipowners have for ages engaged sailors on the principle of profit-sharing besides wages. If labourers should have a share in the increase of wealth, they would be able to consume a vast amount more of manufactures and products of the soil, so that the home market would be expanded to a degree not easy to calculate, while poor-rates would be reduced. The feelings between classes would be softened, and the growing sway of Democracy would be in far less danger of being misdirected by demagogues.

J. B.

Canonbury, November 17th, 1890.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR, — The remarks of your correspondent "F. T. P.," in the PULPIT for November 8th, seem to call for some notice and explanation from Dr. Hobart and Dr. Salmon rather than from myself. There is one assertion of his, however, to which I must take exception. Towards the end of the letter, "F. T. P." says: "Mr. Heber Evans represented St. Luke at first as a Jew, saturated with the language of the LXX., and now to meet a cogent argument of mine against the use of the classics, he claims for him a knowledge of them," etc. I beg to say that several years ago I ventured to point out that the Acts of the Apostles was "evidently written by a Jew," who "continually expresses himself in the words and phrases of the Jewish Scriptures, the LXX. version;" and I added, "plainly it is the work of an educated, able, travelled writer," quoting at the same time Olshausen's remark that "the style of the preface is pure Greek," and Jerome's observation that "of all the Evangelists, Luke was the one best acquainted (*eruditissimus*) with the Greek language," and I also said "there can be no denying the all-embracing range of the author's mind, seeing that he gives such an accurate account of such multifarious and widely-different subjects. . . . . He must have been very observant, very intelligent, and very highly educated."

In a recent letter which "F. T. P." criticises, I quoted from the *Dictionary of the Bible*, "whilst Hebraisms are frequent, classical idioms and Greek compound words abound. The number of words used by Luke only is unusually great, and many of them are compound words, for which there is classical authority." Therefore, it does not seem a great stretch of imagination to suppose that the writer of the Third Gospel "was not ignorant of the most famous Greek authors." This, however, is of no real consequence, inasmuch as whether he was, or was not, acquainted with the actual works of these authors, he was undoubtedly acquainted with the current Greek of the first century, which these famous writers had helped to mould and to create, and in which many of their words and phrases were to be found. Consequently, my position remains substantially the same, "F. T. P.'s cogent argument" notwithstanding.

"F. T. P." continues: "If Mr. Heber Evans claims that St. Luke was so well educated, so widely travelled, and so well read in classical literature, what possible objection can he have to his real opponents, Drs. Salmon, Plummer and their followers, going just one little step further, viz., including Hippocrates and other medical writings then extant, in his studies, and calling them professional?"

There can be no doubt that the author of the Acts was widely travelled, for we have mentioned, as by one well acquainted with them, Jerusalem, Antioch, Athens, Crete, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome and other places. I have no objection to including Hippocrates among the classical writers known to the writer of the Acts. Long ago I said, "although the author of the Acts could not have studied Galen, he may perhaps have read Hippocrates; but that would not of itself entitle him to a medical diploma." I have already pointed out that the vast majority of words in Dr. Hobarts' Index occur in Hippocrates; but then Hippocrates, as the only great authority on medicine for the five centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, was not the private property of the doctors. The writings of Hippocrates in the old world must have been as useful and as familiar as Bull's *Domestic Medicine* in more recent times. My contention, as I have already made sufficiently clear, is that Dr. Hobart's imposing array of quotations from the medical writers *do not*, and *can not*, prove *professional medical training* in the author of the Third Gospel. In my last letter (the PULPIT, Nov. 15th) I have shown that even if the author were a physician he could not possibly have been "the beloved" physician Luke, who was a *Gentile*, while the writer of the Third Gospel was indisputably a "Jew saturated with the LXX." I should have been glad to have had an opportunity of revising that letter, which embodied a good deal of reflection and research; but I will content myself now with saying that page 237, right column, second paragraph, is a quotation from Bishop Pearson, with the exception of the last sentence. Page 238, left column, second paragraph from foot, should read "ὀπτανέσθαι, rare form." Page 238, right column, first paragraph, should read ἀναταξάσθαι διήγησιν; and second paragraph should read "numerical concinnity." On the same page, concluding paragraph, line 6, for καὶ ἐγένετο, read ἐγένετο. Page 238, right column, the last few lines should read: "The words of Bishop Westcott as to St. John apply, with equal point and force, to the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts. 'The whole narrative shows that the author was a Jew. He is familiar with Jewish opinions and customs; his composition is impressed with Jewish characteristics. His special knowledge, his literary style, his religious faith, all point to the same conclusion.'"

H. HEBER EVANS.

November 17th, 1890.

ALL SOULS DAY.

SIR,—After reading the account of the service at St. Albans', All Souls Day, I turned to a book on the subject of Prayers for the Dead, and find the article Communion of Saints formed no part of the Apostles' Creed before the middle of the fifth century—if this article is so important why was it left till so late?

Tradition on which the custom of prayers for the dead is in a great measure based, is certainly unsound. (St. Matt. xv. 3—9.) And when our Lord was asked to teach how to pray, He did not add advice to pray for the dead, or tell us the dead should pray for us. If then the Catholic Church has not laid down this article of Faith, but left everything to pious opinion, let me venture to state mine.

The parable of Dives and Lazarus gives us a picture of the state after death. "Now the modern doctrine of Purgatory finds no support from this parable, or in strict accuracy from many texts of Scripture quoted to support it"—see "Tracts for the Times" on Romanism, article Purgatory; it is the outgrowth of a traffic in souls by the sale of masses and indulgences. So then the doctrine of an intermediate state, as held by many now, seems to me the shadow of this doctrine, retained by a pious desire to benefit the dead, and to stimulate him who prays to try and "follow their good examples." But if people cannot avail themselves of the *Now* (2 Cor. vi. 2), how can they hope to do better in the hereafter? and what right have they to trust to the prayers of their friends, when they are told Jesus is the one Mediator?

Is there any intermediate state, as commonly understood? Is it not an error to carry a measure of Time into the Timeless? Do we not practically pass to the day of Judgment? Has the Catholic Church laid down a doctrine of the intermediate state? Did it do so at Chalcedon? Was Chalcedon a true Œcumenical Council? Were not councils after 325 growing political rather than religious, and so quarrelsome as to show the fruits of the Spirit were wanting?

That many prayed for the dead is not to be questioned, and the opinions of early Fathers can be quoted in favour of the custom; but what is the opinion of any man worth—it is only acceptable so far as it agrees with your own. The only *opinions* on which we may rely, are those of our Lord and His Apostles. And how very strange it is that no one returning from the dead ever told us anything about it—but this may be explained by the fact that they had been *asleep* in Abraham's bosom, and therefore could know nothing about it. Samuel when called back complained of being disturbed as out of sleep or rest. Only good people were allowed to rise again.

It is pleasant to think of our friends departed, as in bliss, we could not bear to think of them as in Hades with Dives. Now we are told that we all die in a state of grace, or no grace. In the first we are forgiven and live—in the second we perish. And also that by our prayers we cannot alter the Judgment. Then is there any use in prayers for the dead? But we are told that we are to pray for the faithful in Paradise that their state may be ameliorated, and that we must not pray for those in Hades. Is this charitable? Now I think there is a great difference between prayers for the dead and commemorating the dead, for in this we pray generally that God of His mercy will forgive us and them our sins, and to hasten His kingdom, we pray for all; and this is just. But in prayers for the dead we are to name our departed friends and so deal with the unseen world on worldly lines, making the beneficial results to depend on the energy of friends here, or those whom they may influence, as if for an election of *blind* pensioners, making it a question of anything but real merit.

That prayers for the dead is or was a common custom, does not prove it a sound doctrine. At death man passes into the Presence of God Who is everywhere, thus *distance* is only a term to distress the body; and since God Is, and with Him everything is present, *time* is a measure to distress the soul. To us, carnally-minded we can only think and speak of the intermediate state as measurable when it is immeasurable, and is timeless. The mistake is surely in trying to carry our ideas into the next world, as if Eternity could be limited.

It seems to me that there are three places after death. The triads of mythology, Olympus, Hades, and Tartarus combine to show an agreement of opinion in three-fold conditions in a future state. And Pythagoras taught in a threefold line, viz., the terrestrial condition—earth; the luminous after death, where men suffered for sin, and the ethereal, a state of bliss beyond the stars. We are told St. Paul was caught up into a third heaven. Then, as a parallel, may there not be three hells: Hades, Gehenna, and the Bottomless Pit. Now if there are three heavens as there are three lights—the sun, the moon, and the stars—these differing in glory as representing the many mansions, teaching that those in the first place under the altar, reserved certainly for martyrs, and I should think for Moses and Elias, all the Apostles and confessors enjoying in the blaze of light the beatific vision which renders them impatient, and compels them to cry out, "How long, O Lord, holy and true!" but are they praying for the good of anybody? are they praying as St. Stephen prayed? are they forgiving as they hope to be forgiven? At best they are praying their enemies may be speedily punished, and that the punishment being the sooner ended, they too may be admitted into Heaven. "The how long" cannot be measured by time, but influenced by the desire to be admitted to the highest place, which is almost within reach. Then the second state, called Abraham's bosom, the faithful but ordinary saints of whom Lazarus was the type, and who are asleep passively waiting! The third and lowest state, Hades, who are anxious that those whom they have left behind should not fall into condemnation.

The first, we see, are lost in joy unsatisfied, and which joy does not allow them to look behind or think of earth. The second are at rest, asleep in peace; they cannot look behind; for, if they did, they would see too much to afflict their souls, and to destroy or disturb their rest. While the third, those in Hades, are awake with remorse and pleading—not because they now *see* their brethren, but because they know of the ill lives of those left behind. Thus we see the first will not plead for us, the second cannot, and the third does, but to no avail.

C. J. W.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—The end of all controversy is, or at least ought to be, to establish truth. The present is on Confirmation Grace. We are confronted, as I think, with teaching contrary to that of the Church of England. I have sought to bring it out to the fore in definite shape; so that we might look at it for ourselves, and either condemn it, or otherwise, as it deserves. But my efforts so far are fruitless.

Last week, as I thought, Mr. Lawrence was clearly shown to be in the wrong. He said that prayer was not always answered at the time, etc., etc.—a truism, which everybody was ready to admit. But then, as is

also clear, if all the prayers were unanswered at Baptism, no grace would then and there be conferred. Yet he holds "Baptismal Grace." In other words, he stands convicted of self-contradiction. And further, and this is also to the point, those who hold "Baptismal Grace" and "Confirmation Grace," would not follow him in allowing that the grace was something to be looked for hereafter. All this is very different from the statement which he puts into my mouth.

It is quite clear that we must have definitions. Mr. Lawrence understands by faith a thing which to my mind does not deserve the name. It is not a faculty at all. "It has in the abstract," he says, "very little, if any meaning." I am very sorry to hear him say this. It is all the world to me. It is "the gift of God," and is priceless. Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε. It is utterly impossible that faith, as a faculty of the Spirit, could do otherwise than be exercised in God. We call that superstition which leads the devotee to throw himself under the car of his idol

It would be impossible for Coleridge or any one else to show that men by reason find out God. If Mr. Lawrence asks by what faculty men apprehend God, my answer is, God reveals himself to faith. Faith is the faculty. I think I have said something like this before; but it will not suffer by repetition. Reason cannot take of the things of God. It is not its province.

Mr. Lawrence does not think I convinced him of quibbling. I am sorry for this. But, if otherwise, why does he not prove his point? He says, "he cannot pardon me for saying that reason leads a man to drink whiskey." I hope he sees that this is toying with the illustration rather than dealing with the argument. But now see what the observation involves. Every man that drinks whiskey is devoid of reason. I should say of reason that it goes as often wrong as right, or pretty nearly so. I am happy to see that in this particular instance Mr. Lawrence's reason does not fail him. As a rule, it is far better for a man in health not to touch any intoxicants. But this matter is not in question.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Nov. 22nd, 1890.

SIR,—Mr. Sandlands' very brief notice of my letter in a P.S., and his avoidance of any real reply thereto are, I think, an acknowledgment of his inability to do so. In his short notice there are *two* statements, one of which is untrue. I deny that it is "as easy to explain one thing as another." It is not as easy to explain the "day" in Gen i., and all God's act of creation, as to explain the action of the warm sun upon the moist earth after a shower. It is not as easy to explain the influence of the moon on the tides, as the influence of soap on skin when we wash our hands. It is not as easy to explain the Church's words, "be confirmed by the Bishop," as to explain how *transgression* (walking across or beyond) comes to mean sin (going across or beyond, or outside the path of duty). Then Mr. Sandlands puts forward "teaching" as a remedy for the evil ignorance I have described. But will Mr. Sandlands tell me how it is that ten, twenty, thirty, generations of scholars—all *taught*—have all passed by, and yet the ignorance remains? He ignores altogether the inquiry how it is that "the instructions given to many generations of candidates have had no effect in dissipating dense, dark, erroneous views." And thus he allows that "the candidates of to-day will be, after all our instruction, teachers hereafter of equally wrong views." Teaching should be like the photographing of an image on a clear plate. This is due to the amount of the sun's light.

No increase of that light will make perfect a photograph on a blurred plate. The first duty would be to prevent the plate from becoming blurred—by damp, for instance. And so, before he can *teach* objective truth, Mr. Sandlands must have the minds of candidates pure and free from error. Teaching should not be the removal of error, but the introduction of that which is true. How will Mr. Sandlands accomplish this? I reserve my own answer, as perhaps meanwhile I may be better instructed.

2 In one of the innumerable papers—weekly or daily—which now court public favour, there recently appeared a short paragraph about child-marriage in India. The writer spoke of the early age at which, in that country, girls arrived at womanhood; and, as exactly synonymous therewith, he used these words—*arrive at years of discretion*. Now these last words are used in the Prayer-book for the time when young people should present themselves for Confirmation. Surely it is evident that the paragraph-writer considered these words to mean an arrival at puberty. I merely give the above instance of the use of words, in order to illustrate (I will not say *prove*, because I will not argue from an individual case to a general law), the truth of what I have said in my first letter. People think they have arrived at *the age* when they should *be confirmed*.

And nothing more certainly helps to establish this erroneous view than the modern practice of making the time of Confirmation the same or nearly so as the time of coming of age in the physical sense of the words. I cannot be more explicit. In my own diocese the Bishop fixes fourteen as the age, with a modified permission to present candidates at even an earlier age. But enough on this subject. I fancy I have said enough to lead my brethren to consider very seriously whether it is not the fact that a large number of candidates have no other idea of Confirmation than a something to be done to them at or about the age when in the course of nature they arrive at manhood and womanhood. About the time when natural events occur, young people are told (in the language of our Church) to take something upon themselves. They have heard over and over again that they are *to be confirmed*. And I submit that a confusion of thought is inevitable, and they unavoidably come to the conclusion that their *coming of age* (physically)—their *taking something on themselves*—and their *being confirmed*—are connected.

3. A living prelate, soon after his appointment, went down to a Confirmation in an important parish in his diocese. The curate-in-charge had gone about the parish; and, like a clerical broom, had swept together eighty-six young people who had not *been confirmed*—(I use the popular language)—I was present at that Confirmation, and knew all the circumstances. I knew how little the hearts of those candidates were touched with the solemnity of what they were doing—that some of them looked forward eagerly to the game customary in the neighbourhood after a Confirmation—the game of Kiss-in-the-Ring—I know for a fact that only one of those eighty-six came afterwards to Holy Communion. But of course the Bishop supposed that a great work was going on in that parish, and he quickly promoted the curate to a living. Eighty-five persons had gone through a form, and went home thinking *they had been confirmed*. I ask Mr.

Sandlands and others whether they think that any Grace (gift) was conferred on such persons. *I do not.* I do not believe that grace is like the egg which an insect deposits with its ovipositor beneath the skin of an unripe apple or pear—to be developed, perhaps, or perhaps not, at some future time. I believe that God's grace is guaranteed and promised to His faithful people whenever they turn to Him—early or late in life—but is not given indiscriminately to every one who comes before the Bishop, and receives the imposition of hands, &c. And I should like to know how those gentlemen would prove (?) my unbelief to be wrong, except by quoting the passive tense—"to be confirmed by the Bishop"—words which to my mind are a phrase merely describing the Bishop's ministerial act of laying on of hands and prayer for God's blessing on the candidate. Mr. Vernon, Mr. Sandlands. Mr. Lawrence, &c. are at serious variance in regard of the grace of Confirmation, and I claim to be as near the truth as any one of them when I deny the grace or gift of God to be bestowed on persons whose hearts are far from Him.

4. All the services of our Church are written under the idea that those who use them are true, intelligent, and obedient members of our Church. The Baptism services all through suppose this. So does the Communion Service, the service for Matrimony, with its direction for subsequent reception of Holy Communion, the Churching Service, with a similar order, the Visitation of the Sick, and the Burial of the Dead, with the expression of its sure and certain hope. In like manner, our Confirmation Service supposes that the candidates are really intelligent, living, obedient members of our Church, and are making a renewal of promises which they *understand*, and, God helping them, *intend to keep.* I venture to assert that the service never was intended for use by thoughtless, careless, ignorant young men and women; and I know of no more grievous and heart-aching sight than the presentation indiscriminately of all young people to be confirmed by the Bishop. How many—rather, how few—of us can put our hand on our heart, and solemnly say that we think all those whom we present are *fit* (see Rubric)? And why do our Bishops absolutely neglect the Rubric, which says, "*if the Bishop approve of them.*" We clergy are not to present them unless we deem them *fit*; and thereupon the Bishops are to *approve* of them. How sadly is this extreme care and caution of our Church neglected! And soon afterwards the clergy grieve that their instruction appears to have vanished away. Could they expect otherwise? I cannot see how it could be otherwise. I confess that I regard Confirmation as the door of entrance to the privileges of Holy Communion. And unless a candidate assures me of his earnest desire to be a communicant, and his intention to come (as our Church directs) as least three times a year, I decline to admit him or her as a candidate. I prefer that he should leave Confirmation alone—as I think it is his duty to do—until he be ready and desirous to communicate. To give a ticket of *approval* (which, in truth, is no part of my duty—it is the Bishop's) when I know from his own lips that he does not intend to be an obedient member of the Church is to make myself party to a lie, and a lie in spiritual things.

A CLERGYMAN FOR FORTY YEARS.

Nov. 20th.

P.S.—I am sorry to say anything that is not *agreeable* to Mr. Lawrence. But I must tell him that my first letter is not a hoax; nor is this letter. My views are the result of long and active experience. And Mr. Lawrence is wholly out of court, for he, as a layman, can lay no claim thereto.

2. I cannot congratulate Mr. Lawrence on clear-headedness. To attack unfortunate language which leads to misapprehension is quite a different thing from attacking the service or ordinance wherein such pernicious language is used. There is a well-known text, "I know nothing by myself." All scholars know that "by" here means "against." Yet how often has the text, as it stands in the Authorised Version, been misunderstood! If I advocate a revision of the Authorised Version, then I am, according to Mr. Lawrence, attacking the Bible, as if I thought it downright pernicious. When Mr. Lawrence can afford us a better claim to his being heard, I shall have more to say to him. At present he shows me no claim at all.

Nov. 23rd.

THE first prize offered by the Sunday-school Union for the best Christmas carol (original words and music) has been awarded to the Rev. S. Childs Clarke, vicar of Thorverton, Devon, and Mr. Arthur H. Brown, of Brentwood.

THE formal order which will issue from the Archbishop's Court, with reference to the points decided against the Bishop of Lincoln, will not be ready for some days. If the promoters wish to appeal, notice of the fact must be given on or before Friday week—that is to say, within fifteen days from the delivery of the judgment.

WE regret to learn that the Rev. Wilson Carlile has suffered in health from his devotion to the directorship of the Church Army. Mr. Carlile's unsparing activity in the work, says the *Record*, may well have undermined his strength. To the Church Army his loss would at first sight seem irreparable. Mr. Carlile and his early colleague, the Rev. F. S. Webster, are the two men who did most to win for the Army a definite measure of confidence and support amongst Churchmen. The *St. James Gazette* says that Mr. Carlile has not relinquished his control of the Society. He has accepted a small country parish in order to "retain his regained health," but as the former incumbent received only about £90 last year the financial gain to Mr. Carlile is merely nominal.

PROFESSOR SAYCE has resigned the Deputy-Professorship of Comparative Philology at Oxford and has this week taken his leave of the University. He will be much missed in Oxford. For many years past he has been the most prominent of Oxford researchers, and has conducted his investigations, if not always with caution and judgment, still with a singleness of purpose, a zeal for truth, an energy and perseverance which could not fail to command admiration and respect. The position in which the office he has vacated stands is somewhat obscure and anomalous. It is, I believe, under the terms of the decree which relieved Professor Max Müller of the necessity of lecturing, competent for him to appoint another deputy in Professor Sayce's place; but as the work of editing the sacred books of the East is now nearly completed, it would seem a pity if the Professor himself does not resume duties for which he is himself so admirably qualified, duties which the University will be slow to believe that any deputy can perform with equal efficiency.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Aglen, Rev. A. S., Rector of Alyth and Meigh ; Archdeacon of the United Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, and Canon of Perth.

Anderson, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Studham, Dunstable.

Baker, Rev. W. H., London Diocesan Home Missionary.

Ball, Rev. C. R., M.A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral.

Ball, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.

Block, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul-at-Hook, Surrey.

Bockett, Rev. Edward Arthur Bradney, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Southborough, Kent.

Bradshaw, Rev. G., M.A., Chaplain to the Durham County Asylum.

Cautley, Rev. Proby Littler, M.A., Rector of Quainton, Bucks.

Caplan, Rev. H., East London Clergyman.

Cargill, Rev. Ebenezer, B.A., Vicar of Kenley, Salop ; Rector of Abenhall, Gloucestershire.

Cornwall, Rev. A. W., M.A., Curate of St. Catharine's, Gloucester ; Vicar of Coleford.

Green, Rev. William Arthur, B.A., Rector of Winterton, Norfolk.

Johns, Rev. W. S., M.A., Vicar of St. Teath's, Cornwall.

Karney, Rev. G. S., M.A., Vicar of Melton Mowbray ; Vicar of St. John the Evangelist's, Paddington.

Long, Rev. D., M.A., Rector of Beachampton, Bucks ; Rector of Bincombe-with-Broadway, near Weymouth.

Long, Rev. F., Curate of St. Margaret's, Altrincham ; Special Service Clergyman in the Diocese of Chester.

Luckman, Rev. C. F., Curate of St. John's Anglican Church, Buenos Ayres ; Chaplain of Cordoba and Tucuman, diocese of the Falkland Isles.

Maughan, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Curate of Maresfield, Sussex ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Saviour's Chiddingstone, Causeway, Kent.

Maynard, Rev. W. S. F., Curate of Holy Trinity, Horwich ; Vicar of Gressingham, Lancaster.

Molesworth, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Peterborough ; Rural Dean of Peterborough First Deanery.

Nicholson, Rev. William, Vicar of Warter, Yorks ; Assistant-Curate of St. Michael and All Angels', Portsmouth.

Parry, Rev. Edward Archibald, M.A., Rector of Sundridge, Kent.

Phillips, Rev. William Inchbold, M.A., Perpetual Curate of the Lady Margaret, Walworth.

Rickard, Rev. H., M.A., Licensed Preacher in the diocese of Ripon.

Soames, Rev. Douglas, Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class ; Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class.

Stillman, Rev. W. Beaufoy, M.A., Succentor of St. Patrick's Cathedral and Chaplain to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland ; Vicar of Weston, Herts.

Swinnerton, Rev. George Isaac, M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Kingston-upon-Thames.

Townend, Rev. A. J., B.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class ; Chaplain to the Forces, First Class.

Vinter, Rev. A. E., M.A., Vice-Principal of the York Diocesan Training College ; Principal of the Lichfield and Southwell Diocesan Training College, Derby.

Wall, Rev. George William, M.A., Vicar of Bickerstaffe, Ormskirk ; Rector of Sephton, Lancashire.

Worsfold, Rev. Clement Arnold, M.A., Head Master of Worthing College, Sussex ; Licensed Preacher in the diocese of Chichester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Evanson, Rev. Richard Macdonnell, at Llansoy Rectory, on the 18th inst., aged 69.

Hodson, Rev. James Stephen, D.D., F.R.S.E., of Merton College, Oxford, Rector of Sanderstead, at the Rectory, Sanderstead, Surrey, on the 20th inst., in his 75th year.

Powell, Rev. W. F., Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, at Hinton Court, on the 16th inst., aged 87.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time md vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitatey for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness' Electropathetic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible ; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHURCH AN AMBASSADOR IN BONDS.

By the Rev. J. ROBERTSON, M.A., Head Master of Haileybury College, Late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached at Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, on Sunday, October 26th, 1890.

"For which I am an ambassador in bonds."—Ephesians vi. 20.

AN ambassador in bonds: "in a chain." Such is the expression which meets us near the end of the Epistle for this day. It is repeated in substance elsewhere, "To speak the mystery of Christ, for which I also am in bonds"; and again, "I being such a one as Paul the aged, and now a prisoner also of Christ Jesus."

How familiar, yet how strange is the picture here brought before us! Paul the aged; Paul and his Praetorian at Rome. What fresh touch or tint can be added worthy of that portrait and its grouping, or what new moral be drawn from it? All fitting things have been said and written of the great Apostle well and often, and not least well quite recently under the dome that bears his name, from what the preacher so touchingly called an empty pulpit, though in no empty tones.

Nor can the situation be well treated briefly, as an isolated incident. The tragic dignity and pathos of it lies in a full comparison of St. Paul's past with his present; of Paul roving and unresting with Paul in manacles; of the fiery heat of thirty with the subdued intensity of sixty. The spiritual irony of it lies in the contrast between his present and his future, between Paul, to all human eyes, cribbed cabined and confined, and Paul still going forth through the centuries to the ends of the earth, a steward and organiser of the new order of the world, from Rome to Geneva, from Iona to Columbia or Zanzibar.

From Damascus to Rome! What a career that was, if we recall it in the barest outline. First the young Hebrew of Hebrews and Pharisee of Pharisees of the nobler sort; of an impetuous ardour which we see early in the days of its misguidance or self-will, "in zealous fury flashing to bind and crucify," and a cultured subtlety which we only see afterwards as it gleams interwoven with the flashes of the sword of the Spirit. Then that "sudden blaze around him poured" and "the voice heard by him alone." Then those days of the silent desert with no witness but that Master in whom he was to be henceforth absorbed and transfigured; or what word can we coin for that self-surrender and identification with the spirit of the Lord, which was to remain an ideal of aspiration for the best and holiest of men thereafter? "I in them, and they in me"; the promise of those words yet lives, but for how many, for what capacious or tender soul here and there can we claim its fulfilment in like measure? We think of the most saintly of our time as they pass from us, and do we not find ourselves appraising the divine life that was in them by this very standard?

Then came the disentanglement of the new from the old, or rather of the bursting germ from its protecting husk; and all the missionary fervour and ferment of that astounding quarter of a century; the devouring energy of will combined with the most sensitive sympathy, the most impressive individuality with a splendid self-effacement, the burnished surface of endurance with the core of infinite yearnings, all the tissue of a noble nature shot with the cross fibres of a light interfused from Heaven. We trace him step by step, through triumph and tribulation, through joy and gainsaying, to where we now find him standing in the Eternal City; so men have called it by an earthly counterfeit.

The past of Rome he knew, and with what eager eyes must he have now looked on the heirs of such a history. He knew their rise and growth to be the reigning representatives of that Gentile world for whose souls he would gladly spend and be spent: he knew them as once pre-eminent when at their best, among those uncovenanted children who, "having no law, were a law unto themselves." The present of Rome he knew all too well, her brilliant degeneracy, her imperial debasement. The future of Rome he could not know, the generations of her political decay, the centuries of her ecclesiastical supremacy. He knew not how his name and aim should yet be intertwined with hers; save only that he stood within her jurisdiction, and might any day by his death add one more line of shame to the crimson record of her cruelties. But not quite yet, if in truth it was so in the end. For to the oxymoron of an "ambassador in bonds" is added this final touch of irony, that the last days of the greatest of human lives are wrapped in the obscurity of uncertain tradition.

But "an ambassador in bonds"! Of all the paradoxes is not this the strangest? How different are the first suggestions of that high title! What pomp and pageantry, what visible pride of conscious authority, what obeisance of courteous reception, what glad welcome or reverential awe! But hardly a prison and a chain!

We may perhaps force a parallel here and there from history. A Regulus carries his twofold message not of Carthage to Rome, or Rome to Carthage, but to each in turn the resolve of his own undaunted patriotism, though "well witting what the torturer's

art designed him." Or the majesty of a British embassy is outraged in the fate of a Cavagnari. Some such one or two we may dare to count as pendants here in outward circumstances.

But what an envoy was this! Paul the veteran, "an Apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God." Of what a kingdom! none less than τὰ ἐπουράνια "the heavenlies." With what a commission! "The dispensation of the mystery that had been hid from all ages and generations." And all the stranger is it, if we press home the word "ambassador," as standing here by no mere figure, but in fact; not for the mere interpreter of a theory, but as the personal messenger of a personal prince; the delegate of the kingdom of Heaven linked b a chain to Cæsar's guardsman.

Is the paradox hereby heightened? or is it just in this thought of his Master, that the enigma of the humiliation is partly resolved? The enigma not only of a Paul in bonds, but of all that inherit him; of the Church herself, for to her let us now pass, not the abstract or ideal, which is the kingdom, but the concrete and visible, all the "congregation of faithful men" east and west, which is the ambassador. Has not this been her solace, as she seemed to stand perennially in bonds; in bonds often of oppression and long travail, in bonds always of very human limitations? King though her Master be, yet He left a work to be wrought out on no new transcendental lines, but on those principles and by those applications of eternal verities to human conditions in which He had Himself stooped to lead the way. "My kingdom is not of this world"; shall then its ambassadors look to be ever really free amid their temporal and terrestrial surroundings? "Made perfect through suffering"; and shall not the servant be as his Lord? "When I am weak then am I strong"; thus the great Apostle fulfilled the same law to which his Master had submitted, and shall the Church he moulded be exempt? If that strength is to be no illusion, shall not the weakness also be often very real?

This thought will go a long way: for an ideally consistent Church on earth it might cover the whole ground of our paradox. But it is to a very earthly vessel that the charge has been consigned, and we shall have sometimes to take account of other bonds in our catalogue, not only the bonds of flesh and blood, but the load of human frailties and passions, the infection of alien fallacies and fashions, and sometimes, too, the trammels of a perilous prosperity counterfeiting freedom, or the weight of her own exuberant ascendency.

Our "Jerusalem that now is" is certainly not yet free. The heavenly force is conditioned by an earthly environment. But it may well be that fetters rather than freedom are after all the very means appointed for her gradual progress and development.

Shall we search the works of nature for illustration? But I need hardly recount the preparation of the natural world from stage to stage through long cycles of travail under durance and pressure. Even if evolution now seems to leave us some points at which more direct intervention may be postulated, yet assuredly the mighty growths of an unfathomable past have been mainly thus conditioned. Creation no longer means for any school of criticism a few moments of unrestrained "fiat." More reverent we deem it now to speak, if we must needs formulate the incomprehensible in terms of time at all, of the long patience, the self-imposed restraint, of omnipotent Wisdom. Thus it comes about that each smiling valley records the Titanic wrestling of imprisoned forces, and each quarried stone the struggle for supremacy or survival of countless generations of life. And in organisms more within our ken, how much of the growth, how much of the strength and grace is bound up with those same balanced conditions of pressure and resistance. Nay more, if diversity of perfections rather than level sameness be the ideal, how much is that multiplicity of life and beauty due to variety in the very repressions, in the very bonds imposed. And as in the physical world, so it is in growths moral and spiritual, in the story of national churches or separate souls. There may be one and the same circumambient air, one and the same sunshine overhead; yet one plant finding its roots barred by the rock, drives suckers afar for moisture; or another, shadowed from the light, puts forth fresh energy till it can rear itself aloft with a stature it would not else have gained. Or some acanthus leaf, crushed by a stolid slab, curls and crinkles round to enrich the eye and hand of man with new types of harmonious curve. Or some blossom that could only see cruel violence in the fate that tore it from its home in the wilderness, finds that it has doubled its petals and become the empress of the garden. Or some oppression of a membrane survives as a priceless pearl.

Such laws of growth through resistance or assimilation of obstacles we trace in the political history of nations, as in the gnarled grit of the mistress of Latium, or of the Netherlands, wrenching from their briny fetters the charter of new freedom; and again in the living tissues of progressive arts or sciences. Even so it is with the Church in her aspect as an ambassador in bonds, an antitype of St. Paul at Rome. We see pressure of early heresies, driving to formulation of creeds; pressure of deeply-rooted traditions of Paganism or local customs too strong to be abolished, but profitably transmuted or innocuously absorbed into the system of Christendom; pressure of secular politics from age to age, forcing her leaders from self-defence into self-assertion, and putting her simplicity in peril, yet thus stamping her high authority more palpably on the world's crass imagination: pressure from centrifugal forces of disruption, to all appearance a sheer bane and loss, yet working out some wider

purpose in the purification of Christian truth or its adaptation to all classes and races and complexions of mind: pressure even of wholesome discipline and lessons of enlargement that could only be learned reluctantly and from adversaries. Such are some of the many turnings in the providential course of this great story, still only in mid-making. Thus has it differed in its rhythmic but constrained progression from the unbroken movement that might have been dreamed or schemed for it by any single or finite wisdom—by the generous impatience of the "sons of thunder," or the masterfulness of a Hildebrand, or even the saintly longings of men that we have known.

So does gain follow pain; but the gain we trace unreadily, the pain and pressure are ever apparent. We see an envoy proclaiming a royal kingdom, yet often flouted; announcing a new liberty, yet herself conditioned: heralding a final harmony, yet constrained to bear or boast diversity and even disunion. We see bonds through long ages, of tyranny in high places, of popular sullenness or superstition, of scholastic and fantastic philosophies: bonds withal self-assumed (must we not admit it?) of cramping prejudice and controversial bitterness; or self-forged from her own best treasures, when some ordinance of man, some tradition of the elders, or the very letter of the scripture itself has in turn been made a yoke too hard to bear.

A complexity this indeed: and all the more so when we reflect that the wheat and tares are growing together: or when we try to grasp Christ's Church as a world-wide whole, and not merely in the branches or sections most near or dear to us: or when we doubt not seldom to what actual persons the inner name and function of true Church or true ambassador is for the time in fact assignable. To find the centre of gravity of "the Church" before generalizing about it, would not seem so easy as is sometimes assumed; nor yet to define at first sight wherein lies her bondage and where her freedom.

There are epochs of the Church in which history displays only spiritual stagnation on the surface, while a strange inversion brings the least Christ-like or Paul-like figures to the top, though a nameless thread of vigorous life somewhere beneath must have been "hid with God." There were generations in which "the religion of her ostensible leaders was based not so much on the foundation of Christ as on the philosophy of Aristotle." And one man asks whether "the profligacy of tenth century popes" or the rack and stake and their moral substitutes are to be classed as examples of the corruption of the Church when free from wholesome constraint and spoiled by worldly success, or of the subjection of the more genuine core of the Church to the chastening discipline of an Egyptian servitude. Or another will ask whether royal supremacy and State support are really guarantees not lightly to be sacrificed of her dignity and stability, or are, as some would plead, but trusses and guiding-irons of a growing tree or branch, helpful fetters for a few centuries, yet fetters still. Such vexed questions we cannot now discuss, but only repeat what few would dispute, that oft-times she has been really weakest when she seemed most strong, strongest when most weak.

Dip into her history, and you are told how great was the relief to the long-suffering community when Constantine enfranchised it: and yet how "the sunshine of prosperity and power called forth profusely in the soil of the Church those noxious weeds of pride, luxury, and wrath, which had been unable to germinate in the winter of its discontent." Or later, you read that the triumph of the priesthood over the Empire in the thirteenth century was "a victory whose abuse by the insolent and greedy pontiffs for some generations made it more ruinous for the cause than a defeat." In our own country, you may be taught that the close of the eighth century was a "golden age" of the Church, more prosperous than before or since, but that "carelessness, indifference, and vice followed swiftly in the wake of its prosperity." Or a thousand years later, the eighteenth century is presented to you as a time of her freedom and security after a splendid history of pangs and struggles, yet as sinking her amid that security into a corrupt or dull indifference, till a day of new revival began,—not first among those in high estate. On the other hand, it is in the record of darker and more troublous times that her truest triumphs are enshrined, and chiefly in a myriad lives of individual men and "prisoners," not always ecclesiastical, or even always Churchmen in the stricter language of their day or our own. They range from Paul and Polycarp, past the great "martyrs and missionaries of Latin Christianity," to the days of Luther at Wartburg, or Latimer at Oxford, or Bunyan at Bedford, and to those of Gordon or Hannington in Africa, or of whomsoever you shall choose of men that were Christ's beset and besieged too often, alas, not by unbelievers, but in the misused name of Christendom itself. For there are lives innumerable of veritable ambassadors in bonds, such as makes us sometimes think more of their heavenly commission and less of their temporal livery. Representatives are they all of the higher law, a law that shows God's providence working, if we may dare to say it, like that English king, of whom it is told that "he profited by defeat as other men by victory."

Such are the ironies of history. It is true that the epochs of prosperity have had their share in the development, sometimes by authoritative council or royal countenance, but often by reaction and indirectly. Yet the broad lines remain, that the service is perfect freedom, but then the service must be made perfect too, and not seldom it is "made perfect through suffering" and a bondage. If during your own more happy and hopeful days a greater freedom is being vouchsafed to do more

and suffer less, you will not forget the lessons of the past, or even the quite possible contents of the future.

A recent essayist uses the expression that "the Church has never yet had free play." He touches on some of her earlier struggles and later divisions, and adds that "the very greatness of its ideal has caused the difficulty.' It is true: if there is a heavenly citizenship on that side, there are terrestrial provincialisms on this. And all this means that the Church still works her way slowly to her ultimate goal in the footsteps of her prototype, as an ambassador in bonds of one kind or other. She may be realising, now and in our own country, better than ever before, that freedom which is defined as the correspondence with, and fulfilment of, the law of one's own nature. And yet in a very real sense, a bondage of constraint and opposition is inherent in that very nature; inherent at least in her office as emissary to an unreclaimed, or imperfectly reclaimed, world. On earth as ambassadors he can never quite be free, for the bonds can only completely cease with the need and the tenure of the embassy.

But if we turn now from difficult abstractions and generalisations to ourselves, or chiefly to you that are now entering on the active work of life, shall we not find that you also are, and must rest content to be, "ambassadors in bonds"? "Ambassadors" you are, and needs must be. Whether destined for holy orders, or as units of the great lay majority, an embassy is laid upon you, and you know it. By your membership in a favoured branch of Christ's Church, by your social position and educational advantages, by all the privileges of country and century, you are even specially commissioned. "No Christian," it has been written, can "rid himself of his share in the function of witness committed to His followers by Christ." Most true: but more, in so far as you are, like St. Paul, exponents not merely of a system, but of a kingdom and a King, you are no longer witnesses only, but accredited envoys. And you are more than envoys, for you have more than a mere despatch, more than even the Gospels and Epistles, to deliver. You are more than mere forwarders of letters. You bear the direct daily burden of a royal voice, to interpret or accompany your despatches. But it is an inward living voice, a message of the Spirit. This message it would be yours still to convey in your word or your life, even if those despatches could be imagined now as destroyed from off the face of the earth.

Your own contribution of testimony may lie in life and example rather than in utterance. But if the days are not yet ripe when all our sons and daughters shall prophesy, and our young men see visions, it is not that the promise of the Spirit has been withdrawn.

But "in bonds." Is this also true of you? Or is it a mere conceit?

You would fain be free: free as air, free with the liberty of youth and strength, of keen wits and ardent hearts, of English tradition and nineteenth century, nay, with you it will be twentieth century, independence. And yet air when absolutely free is but stagnant or profitless. What we call the free air, the breeze balmy or bracing, the gale that works and cleanses, is not self-determined, but obedient to cosmic forces and beneficent laws. But you may possibly find some chains to be loosed: not improbably you will find some encroachments to be resisted. By all means let freedom's cause still supply a high aim and strong incentive. See that she advances not less in the coming thirty years than in those just past; or if that be settled without your help by the surging current of the times, you will doubtless guide and guard her movements, social or intellectual, leading men to prize liberty, not licence, to aim at levelling up, not levelling down. And while working for the liberty of others, you will fairly claim your own share, as unmuzzled oxen.

And yet in your character of witnesses and ambassadors of the kingdom you may still have to learn something of the fetters and checks in which you must needs work and move, some to be accepted as inevitable, some to be chosen as salutary. There are, I suppose, at the outset, the common inheritance, the Baconian *idola* of the tribe, the cave, the mart, the theatre; those prejudices inherent in the race, in the individual, in custom, in system. The meshes of these a strong man may himself burst through and yet find they must be reckoned with in the hostility or the *vis inertia* of the world around him, in things spiritual as well as things scientific. There are the checks on free will to be struggled with, the spells of heredity, and of a man's special place in the social growth of centuries, which the ordinary worker finds as hard to evade as his own shadow. And there are perhaps its own bonds lying on each generation, which though half recognised and half worn through, must wait awhile for their destined genius to rive them quite asunder. There have been many epochs of religious movements as well as secular in which men a little in advance of their age have been hampered with fetters unknown to their sons or grandsons; and though all conventions are not fetters, nor all novelties the truth, yet all reformers and most discoverers have been heavily weighted by the dulness or rancour of their time.

But besides necessary bonds how many constraints and trammels must be voluntarily welcomed by the rank and file if good work is to be done in a crowded world. "His soul was like a star and dwelt apart" will now more rarely than ever fit the busy worker.

A wheel rather in a great machine; a servant of some great institution, bound by its routine and custom, yet multiplying his personal power by aid

of its great name and tradition; a unit of some society or council, which controls half the individual will and judgment, while lending corporate sanction to the efficacy of the other half; such are the terms under which the members of an intricate civilisation must often work and be glad to work, for spiritual not less than political ends. A few exceptional thinkers of each generation may happily be spared to stand apart; but most men have to accept the position that organic social life is a compromise. Not indeed in the sense in which St. Paul would have scorned compromising the truth, but as he would "become all things to all men, that he might by all means save some," or as "the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee."

But whatever fetters you may accept or reject, one there is at least that you will surely never seek to evade, and one there is in which each of you will surely pray that he may never entangle himself. The former is, of course, the bond of conscience. And at this moment we must refer to it not in any of its derived forms, such as the call of patriotism, or the sentiment of "*noblesse oblige*"; nor in any of its applied forms in which human error or prejudice may be mingled, and fresh information needed, but rather in its first elemental and universal aspect. For you well know there is no surer teaching than that which bids us confess that when we look into our conscience, we find therein a claim on behalf of a higher order of things, and "are face to face with a purpose" that we shall be good; that this purpose implies perforce a purposer; that the purposer must be himself what he calls us to be; that this forms "our first true conception of God"; and that of subsequent attainment, whether through experience or outer revelation, this is the basis. And this claim is the one binding bond from which no soul may seek to escape and live, not so much because it is the standing corrective to our carnal aspiration for a false freedom, but because its beneficent constraint is our first inward assurance of a living God of goodness.

The other chain, to be prayed against, is the memory of a grievous sin. When Belisarius executed some drunken murderers in his wild army, he told them "he would permit no man, even the bravest, to carry into battle against the enemy hands that were not pure and innocent of crime." God's mercy sometimes works far otherwise, yet we may well suppose that His highest commission is chiefly reserved for those who have served Him from their youth up, unhaunted by such memories. I speak not now of little sins, the dust by the way that needs not but the washing of the feet. No preacher will speak lightly of little sins, single or aggregate; but I mean now such graver fall as, though bitterly repented and forgiven, yet galls the ambassador with iron that eats into the marrow. Many a zealous servant of God may have worn such a chain, but what would he not have given to be rid of it? St. Paul himself was not without some bitter self-reproach of the days of his misdirected zeal, albeit through ignorance. But I speak now of such wilful thing as may dog the steps and clog the utterance of prophet or philanthropist, that may pinion the wing of preacher or poet, that may mingle itself in his every denunciation of baseness or exhortation to purity with the whisper, "Thou art the man."

In a recent mystical novel the heroine on the brink of a moral precipice, sees "IT for the first time. It was only for a second. All the power of hell was exerted to cancel the sight; but it was too late. She had seen by the power and light of God's conscience in a pure spirit, she had seen, at the moment of a fatal error, the face of a wilfully committed sin."

Happy are they who see such vision before, not after, as a warning betimes, not as an ineffaceable phantom starting up between them and the work of their battle against evil. Such phantoms are like the invisible spirits of previous victims, that in a grim German drama parry the duellist's thrusts and expose him defenceless to his foe. Or as when Alboin the Lombard would have drawn sword on his assassins, but found the vengeance of his queen Rosamund had glued it to the sheath.

Shackles inevitable of time and space and mortal flesh; iron chains laid upon us by fortune or foemen; golden manacles of conscience and a royal command; these the ambassador shall proudly wear and yet find the service of his King is perfect freedom. Bonds of allegiance, of brotherhood, of peace, may these too all be yours. But far from you all in the coming years of your good work, be the crippling memory of ill-spent days; far from you be the paralyzing weight of some wilfu sin, once looked at in the face, too late!

Here I had ended, but I will not leave you with words of ill-omened sound. Rather let me say, You are young and strong; you have the years of your embassy in front of you, and the making of them is still in your own hand. Think of St. Cuthbert: "His life was lightning, and therefore he could make his speech thunder." Think of Origen: "As his word so was his conduct, and as his conduct so was his word."

THE Archbishop of Canterbury is staying with the Dean of Windsor.

WE are requested to state that the Rochester confirmations announced for 1891 will be undertaken by Bishop Barry until Easter.

WE understand that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London, have offered the Bishopric of Mauritius to the Rev. William Walsh, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's and superintendent of the London Diocesan Home Mission, and that he has accepted the nomination. The vacancy is caused through the resignation of Dr. Royston.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1890.

THE CHURCH AND "ASSISTED" EDUCATION.

THE Bishop of London presided on Wednesday, the 26th inst., over a very interesting Conference consisting of members of the National Society's Standing Committee and representatives of diocesan and local Boards of Education. The Conference was attended by several Bishops and church dignitaries, and also by laymen who are noted for the interest they take in the cause of voluntary education. The Conference had considerable significance, because in the speech from the Throne at the opening of Parliament the previous day there occurred a notable sentence addressed to both Houses :—"Your attention will be invited to the expediency of alleviating the burden which the law of compulsory education has in recent years imposed upon the poorer portion of my people."

Ever since the passing of the Education Act in 1870, the subject of free education has been from time to time mooted, and has gradually become what is termed a "plank in the Radical platform." Like many other Radical notions, there is in the idea of free education, an element of benevolence which however is distorted out of its true proportions. No doubt the Premier, who, throughout his official career has exhibited a large amount of prescience, sees that unless the question is dealt with by the present Government, it will certainly be legislated upon much more inconsiderately the next time the Radicals are in power. It seems to be the function of a Conservative Government to legislate in a calm and judicial manner upon questions which would otherwise be approached from an hysterical stand-point.

The Conference to which we refer exhibited the curious fact that even among Churchmen there exists a great disparity of opinion upon this question of free education; and while the lay element in the Conference somewhat favoured the idea, assuming it to be so qualified as to prevent interference with the existing systems of voluntary education, the clerical element appeared to view the subject in its true logical aspect. The Bishop of St. Albans announced that the more he looked at free education the less he liked it, and the Bishop of Lichfield amplified the reasons given by his brother of St. Albans for the view announced. These reasons are by no means founded on sentiment, but are as severely logical and consistent with the connection between cause and effect in our national history as it is possible for arguments to be. The Bishop of Lichfield pointed out, what surely every man who has thought at all seriously about the history of his country must recognise, that the structure of our national character is reared upon the basis of individual independence.

A generation has now passed away since the idea that a parent is responsible in the eyes of God and man for the education of his children first became undermined by the adoption of the principle of compulsory education. Immediately after the passing of that measure it became apparent that if the principle of compulsion was to be carried out, provision must be made for remitting school fees. And there is no doubt that many persons have been unnecessarily and injudiciously freed from monetary responsibility.

The adoption of free education would strike a very serious blow at parental responsibilty, and the effect of weakening that individual responsibility would be felt, in the course of a few years, in the destruction of national responsibility. It seems amazing that many good, and otherwise sensible people cannot realise the very simple first principle of all society, that the whole must be of the nature of its parts; and that therefore if a man is relieved of all feeling of responsibility, a community of such men must lose that sturdiness of character and determination to rely on self-help which has made English history. It is probable that whatever course Lord Salisbury may have in his mind, the matter will not come under Parliamentary discussion for many weeks, and during that period it will be well for all Churchmen to look the question fairly in the face, and boldly announce their views upon it. For generations the Church of England has done magnificent work in the cause of education without interfering with the responsibility of parents. And Churchmen generally should insist upon legislation—if there must be new enactments—taking such a form that elementary education shall not become merely a channel for imparting knowledge, but shall be employed for the development of character.

Reviews and Notices.

'IN DARKEST ENGLAND AND THE WAY OUT." By General Booth. London.

THE interest, which has been shown in this work by the general public, is an encouraging proof of the strong desire, which exists everywhere, to investigate, with the object of improving, the conditions under which the poorer classes of our fellow-creatures have to pass their lives. The book contains sensational writing, as might be expected from its author, and exaggerations, though its writer has carefully striven to restrain his own exuberance; but there is enough of reality, both in its picture of existing evils, and in the remedies which it proposes, to render it worthy of the closest attention of all Christian philanthropists. We propose to follow, in our review, Mr. Booth's own division of his subject into two halves—the Darkness, and the Deliverance—the evils now existing, and their remedies.

It must be admitted, even by the "General's" admirers, that his *forte* is not statistics. On this point his estimates are vague, and sometimes contradictory. His representation of the number of what he calls "the Submerged Tenth" in England is founded almost entirely on the information furnished by his namesake, Mr. Charles Booth, in his work on the East End of London. This latter author calculates that in East London, out of a total population of 993,000, there are—

Paupers in Institutions	17,000
Loafers, Criminals, etc.	11,000
Starving Persons (existing on Casual Earnings, between 18s. per week and chronic want)	100,000
Total	128,000

Upon this last figure, the "General" founds his estimate for all England. Admitting that in the East End poverty is more extreme than elsewhere, he takes fifteen times, instead of thirty-one times, as the probable amount of "the submerged classes" in all England. This gives him (after certain deductions) a total of 1,905,500, to which, however, he adds, without sufficient reason as appears to us, "another million, representing those dependent upon the criminal, lunatic, and other classes not enumerated here, and the more or less helpless of the class immediately above the houseless and the starving." He thus arrives at a total of three millions. Mr. Giffen, however, who is a more thoroughly informed, as well as a soberer calculator, places the distressed classes at 1,800,000 only. Whichever be the case, the evil is great, and calls loudly for a remedy, if such is possible.

The next question that naturally arises is, What is already being done to help these sufferers? The "General's" reply to this question is, that all the attempts hitherto made, except his own, are absolute failures. "He had intended," he says, "at one time to have devoted considerable space to the description of the existing agencies, together with certain observations, which have been forcibly impressed upon his mind, as to their failure and its cause." But he contents himself with a mere glance at what he calls "the well-meaning, but more or less abortive, attempts to cope with this great and appalling evil." He passes all these attempts somewhat cursorily and superficially in review, and asserts that the workhouse, which is the only legal resource of the destitute, is useless, because it aids only those who have sacrificed the last remnants of their worldly goods, and thus rendered themselves incapable of starting afresh on independent life; that the casual wards are so conducted as to destroy the last remains of self-respect in those who resort to them, and to hinder them from seeking employment; that charity fails through want of concerted action, at which there is at present no attempt—this, in spite of the efforts of the Charity Organisation Society, which imagines itself to have devised a complete machinery to effect such co-operation; that prisons, as at present managed, are useless for reformatory purposes, and are even training schools for crime; that emigration is hopeless unless the persons to be expatriated have had a previous training for colonial life; that education, as at present conducted, does not fit the children for practical life, and corrupts the better class of scholars, through their forced association with the offspring of the degraded classes; that trades unionism is only a support to the skilled workman, and hardly touches the unskilled; that co-operation, though it affords the brightest hopes for the future, cannot be immediately applied to assist the existing needs; that Utopian schemes, such as Land nationalisation and Socialism are also incapable of immediate application, while the evils to be combated, and the wants to be supplied, are all pressing and urgent; that thrift is impossible to people who have nothing to save.

He does not think it necessary to observe that, on most of these agencies, earnest philanthropic thought and effort have been employed for years; that, in every case, improvement, although but too slow and too imperfect, may be traced; and that, as Christian charity is brought to bear more and more on each, the defects which he observes, and which others have observed before him, all tend to diminish, and will, it may be hoped, finally disappear.

Having thus cleared the decks of all his competitors, in whom he seems hardly able to recognise fellow-labourers, the "General" steps forward with all the self-confidence of any of the advertising egotists—a "Sequah," a Pears, a Barnum, a Boulanger, or even a Gladstone—as the one cleanser of all filthiness, the one successful philanthropist of our age, the one physician of the deadly disease, under which our poorer population is labouring.

Mr. Booth, when addressing himself to the consideration of his remedy, propounds seven preliminary conditions, which every scheme for the advantage of the lapsed classes must fulfil. We account this one of the best parts of his book, and we therefore quote, in a very condensed form, these seven requisites.

1. The first essential is to *change the man*, if his character has been the cause of his degradation and misery.

2. The *circumstances* under which he lives must be changed, if these have debased his character.

3. The remedy must be commensurate with the evil, giving hope to all the lost.

4. The scheme must be permanent.

5. It must also be immediately applicable.

6. It must not indirectly injure the person whom it is sought to benefit, as is the case with nearly all charity.

7. The aid which it affords to one class must not tend to injure another.

We think that Mr. Booth's scheme would be found to offend most against his last condition, unless the

persons benefited were taken away almost immediately to the Farm in the country, or to the Over-sea Colony. His workshops and factories in the City must tend to displace and supersede the labour of independent operatives. But we are rather anticipating the description of his scheme, of which we propose to give an outline sketch.

His remedy consists of three institutions, which he proposes at once to found, if he can obtain sufficient funds—£100,000 to begin with. These are—

1. The City Colony.
2. The Farm Colony.
3. The Over-sea Colony.

The first of these begins with a Home or Shelter to be established in the midst of every large centre of destitute population. This Home is to furnish a night's lodging with sufficient food and hospitable entertainment to all, who can pay fourpence per night. The guests are, in addition to the creature comforts provided for them, to have the advantage of "a jovial free-and-easy social meeting" conducted according to the methods of the Salvation Army. There are to be girls with their banjos, prayers short and to the point, addresses earnest and free from sanctimoniousness, recitals of personal experiences by those who have already been "soundly saved," accompanied by "bursts of hearty melody" and "rattling and rollicking choruses."

Upon those who are entirely destitute, and therefore unable to pay the fourpence demanded from them, the "General" intends to impose a labour test, requiring them to go first to his labour shed and earn their fourpence, and then "to come in out of the cold and wet into the warm shelter, and enjoy the food and rest and the social evening" as above described.

The Labour Shed, furnishing employment of a varied character to a vast number of persons, will obviously prove a great difficulty; but Mr. Booth considers that he has already tested the plan on a small scale, applying it to an average of ninety persons, and he is not afraid of attempting to furnish employment in the same manner to the many thousands who he hopes may apply to him. He is to have carpenters, shoemakers, tailors, painters, unskilled labourers, all finding some work ready to their hands in these gigantic workshops. To furnish further employment, he proposes to found "a Household Salvage Brigade," who are to collect all refuse food and material that is cast away as useless in the 500,000 houses that he supposes to exist in London. This, he thinks, would at once furnish employment to a whole army of collectors, and the material that they would bring home would give work to an immense additional number. These bands of reformed loafers would sort the waste food into three parts—one portion that was still fit for human use, which would be utilised at the shelters, a second portion that would go to feed cattle and pigs in the Farm Colony, and a third that would be only serviceable for manure. There would be a body of cobblers to translate old shoes into usable ones, and tailors to cut up old clothes into uniforms for the soldiers of the Salvation Army. Old bones would be made into knife-handles or ground for manure, rags would become paper on which to print War Cries, refuse grease would be converted into soap, and old tins into toys or flower-pots. The workshops would thus expand into immense factories, employing almost every sort of trade.

In all these departments, and even in the paper-mill, which will require elaborate machinery and highly-skilled artisans, none but temporary workmen are to be employed—except, we presume, a certain staff of managers and superintendents; and no wages will be paid. The workmen must content themselves with lodging and rations, except in the case of married people with families, who are to receive an allowance sufficient to protect them from the necessity of breaking up their homes. The remainder of the proceeds of their labour is to go to the Salvation Army. We fear that the work turned out by these scratch bodies of casuals, daily arriving and daily departing, would be of a very inferior kind. But if, contrary to our expectation, it proves to possess a fair intrinsic value, then Mr. Booth's organisation, appropriating to itself the greater part of the proceeds of these poor people's toil, would become at once the most grasping of all the sweaters.

The next step beyond the City Shelter is the Cottage Farm. Now here we recognise in Mr. Booth some very true ideas. It is undoubtedly true that the land of England, and especially the parts adjacent to London and other populous towns, could, by careful garden culture, be made to support in health and happiness a largely increased number of hands. And if Mr. Booth, and others following his example, contrive to draw a large part of the country-born people, who are now crowding London with useless hands to the field and garden labour in which their own youth was spent, he and they will have deserved well of their country.

He proposes to obtain sufficient land within a short distance of London, and near a railway. Upon this he would erect barracks and establish a community of the Salvation Army, selecting first from among the inmates of the City Shelters those who were best fitted for the various works requiring to be executed, as builders, agriculturists, etc. On this Farm he proposes to carry on every description of "little agriculture," and "to create a great school of technical agricultural education." In this case, as in the City Shelter, the labourers are to work for their subsistence, receiving no wages, and all the produce of their labour is to go to the Salvation Army, in whose hands "any overplus will go to make the bridge over which any poor fellow may escape from the horrible pit and the miry clay from which they themselves have been rescued."

The persons trained in these institutions are to be drafted partly into agricultural villages in England, but chiefly into colonies beyond the sea. In the former, there are to be allotments of from three to five acres, on which tenants will be assisted to settle, and will henceforth be liable like other tenants to rent, and also to a weekly charge sufficient to repay the advances made at starting; but will, in other respects, be free from the paternal control of Mr. Booth, and be responsible for their own and their families' maintenance.

Thus the "General" will become, amongst his other multitudinous engagements, a landlord of a vast property, with a number of small tenant occupiers. Some of his tenants, even if "soundly saved" before they were placed in possession of their holdings, must be expected to prove defaulters. Then will occur the great difficulty of all landlords, what to do with those tenants who are hopeless failures. What will Mr. Booth do with such? Will he evict them, or suffer them to struggle on, getting deeper and deeper into ruin?

But Mr. Booth's chief hope is the Colony beyond the sea. When his reformed and saved casuals and

loafers have learned in his industrial home colonies habits of discipline and order, he proposes to draft them to a new country, where their regeneration is to be completed. Here a vast tract of land is to be secured, in which the new colonists may be removed as far as possible from all demoralising influences. The Colony will then be prepared, by tried and saved Salvationists, for the reception of the new settlers. These settlers will be brought over from the mother country, in manageable numbers, so that the new country may be able to receive and assimilate them. Mr. Booth admits that his colonial arrangements are not yet matured, but he expects that before the first batch of colonists is sufficiently educated for hopeful emigration, the subject will have been thoroughly studied, and sufficient provisions made for the transportation of the settlers and their establishment in a new land. We may add that Mr. Booth appears to contemplate an independent community possessed of "a strong and efficient government, prepared to carry out and enforce the same laws and discipline to which the colonists had been accustomed in Europe." In fact, his Colony is to be a sort of Utah, possessing the Utensian virtues of industry and sobriety, but free from the Utensian vice of polygamy, ruled by the strictest laws of military discipline, so as to yield implicit obedience to a Lieutenant-Governor on the spot, who will receive all his commands from the Prophet and General beyond the sea. This military discipline, with the unhesitating obedience which it involves, is the corner-stone of Mr. Booth's system. He is to be generalissimo and despot of the whole establishment and all its branches.

In the sketch which we have now given of the whole enterprise, we have omitted, for the sake of brevity, many of the subsidiary branches. But we have explained enough to show our readers that the scheme is an enormous one, requiring, in its chief, great powers of government—we might almost say an imperial mind—in its subordinate officers, not only unwavering self-devotion, but great practical ability in managing both affairs and men ; and, as the sinews of the war, immense sums of money, of which the £100,000 first demanded will prove a very small fraction. Let the philanthropic public, if they will, furnish Mr. Booth, out of their superfluity, with the means for trying his experiment ; it will probably have its measure of success, though very far from equalling his expectations. But do not let them commit the great error of withdrawing their support from the more modest and unobstrusive agencies that have long been busy in the same field. These are imperfect successes, it is true, but they are not the failures which Mr. Booth represents them to be ; and it is unworthy and disingenuous in him to ignore their services.

The scheme, being founded essentially on military discipline, presupposes in its chief, as a necessary condition of success, the highest powers of command. Now, without going the length of supposing Mr. Booth to be a Von Moltke of the religious and charitable world, we are inclined to think that his past success proves him to have great power of ruling and directing the coarser and more uncultivated class of minds. This is, no doubt, the secret of his past achievements, and the same quality will assist him in his wider and more complicated enterprise. But he is now, as he tells us, a man of sixty-one, a time of life when a man's physical energy, except in a few rare cases, begins to decline. It will be some years, as he admits, before his huge Œcumenical enterprise can become thoroughly developed. And, when it has reached its full extension, it will still depend entirely for continued success, on the possession of a head, and a staff of officers, of great capacity and power. Has Mr. Booth taken any steps to provide himself with a successor, when his own powers are exhausted, or in the case that they fail, as those of his wife have failed, before decrepitude arrives? According to present appearances, he means the Generalship to become an heir-loom in his family.

The following gallery of portraits of worthies of the Salvation Army, which we extract from an advertisement at the end of "In Darkest England," will show that at present the first qualification for high command in the Army is either to be the General's son, or to have married one of the General's daughters.

PORTRAITS.

The General.
Mrs. Booth.
The Chief of the Staff.
Mrs. Bramwell Booth.
Marshall Ballington Booth.
Mrs. Ballington Booth.
Commissioner Booth-Clibborn.
Maréchale Booth-Clibborn.
Commissioner Booth-Tucker.
Mrs. Commissioner Booth-Tucker.
Commissioner Eva Booth.
Miss Lucy Booth.
Commissioner Railton.
Mrs. Commissioner Railton.
Commissioner Carlton.
Mrs. Commissioner Carlton.
Commissioner Howard.
Mrs. Commissioner Howard.
Commissioner Smith.
Mrs. Commissioner Smith.

Thus our "General" has already launched into life a family of Napoleonides, and our Pope has surrounded himself with a numerous body of *nepoti*. But what if the son and successor is not found to possess the qualities of his father? Then, in the second generation, the great enterprise must decline and fall.

In conclusion, we, for our own parts, would not do anything to hinder Mr. Booth's enterprise. Let time and experiment prove whether it possesses in itself the elements of permanent benefit to the poor. But we protest most earnestly against his exclusive claims. Few, if any, of his expedients are original, but have been tried already either in this country or elsewhere. It would be a scandal and a shame if the numbers of unobtrusive workmen, who have made the poor the object of their daily labour, their left hand not knowing what their right hand does, should be denuded of support by the philanthropist who blows his own trumpet the loudest. Neither the City Shelter, nor the Agricultural Farm, nor the Over-sea Colony is the invention of Mr. Booth ; nor is his organisation the only body that can conduct such experiments. Let others engage, in generous rivalry, in efforts for the improvement of the destitute population, and then, through these efforts, wise or foolish, successes or failures, the great cause of Christian love will march forward towards its true object—the elevation and salvation of the lapsed and degraded masses.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—It is useless to occupy time and space in showing that there is no inconsistency between the belief of Regeneration in Baptism, and the belief that God answers prayer. The real inconsistency in the premisses is in a minister who baptises children according to our office for baptism, and who does not accept the doctrine of Sacramental Grace.

Faith may be called, with an awkward use of language, a faculty belonging to some persons and wanting to others. But faith is not a faculty of the human mind, and can be so called only by an abuse of language. Superstition is not an opposite of faith; we often speak of a superstitious faith; which is a faith held, or a religious or semi-religious confidence reposed, without being based on a right exercise of the understanding and reason. As I said before, to make opposites of reason and faith is anti-logical, because they are things of different order, between which therefore there can be no contrast.

Mr. Sandlands complains that I trifle with his illustration without dealing with his argument. There is no argument and no illustration. There is a remark about reason and the use of ardent spirits, to the purpose of nothing, with which I do not agree.

The "Clergyman for forty years" tells me that I have no right to have an opinion concerning the Confirmation Service, because I am a layman and have no experience. Parochial experience (which I suppose is meant) can be no help to any one in forming an opinion on such a subject. He tells me also, unless with my want of clearness I completely misunderstand him, that he has not attacked the Confirmation Service. This is much about as if Mr. Parnell should say he has not attacked Mr. Gladstone. In to-day's letter he calls its language pernicious; and in his letter a month ago he says that a Bishop cannot confirm, and that to speak of confirmed persons as confirmed is a grievous falsehood.

When I said that to read such things written by a clergyman is disagreeable, I mean that it is disagreeable in the same way that it is so when one reads extracts from the seditious and blasphemous newspapers.

Nov. 29th. EDMUND LAWRENCE.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND MORALS.

SIR,—There is a remark, in the letter of "J. B.," in the PULPIT of the 29th ult., on which I pray leave to make a reply. Political economists are not generally agreed that labour is the universal agent that produces wealth. Indeed, I would almost deny to anyone the right to call himself an economist who should maintain a position which countless instances directly contradict; and which is contradicted by the individual experience of half the people who ever buy things. No article has value—in other words, nothing is wealth, commercially, for which something else, generally money, cannot be obtained; and the only thing which regulates value is Demand. A thing may have cost millions—the abandoned Panama Canal, for instance—and be worth nothing; and a thing may have cost nothing—a spermaceti whale that has been stranded is an example, and be worth a large sum.

Your correspondent follows the remark that I refer to by another on the assumed tendency of wages to fall. There is no such tendency. On the contrary, the increase in quantity of wealth has the tendency of making wages rise; and not only so, but there is no other factor in producing advances of wages possible, except the increase of wealth. The best statistician of our time, Mr. Giffen, estimates the general advance in the rate of wages in England during the Queen's reign to be more than double.

I most thoroughly agree with your correspondent's views concerning the profit-sharing system. But the general adoption of such a system will probably be gradual; and it must come, indeed it can come only, through economic evolution; that is, it must pay. I do not like to hear it recommended on any other grounds than its commercial advantages; I don't believe in mixing up philanthropy and trade. Indeed, the only success that is possible in commerce is commercial success. If it be said that this is a sordid or selfish view, I answer that it is the only practical view; and not only that, but it indicates the system and the principles which alone can produce good and permanent results. Economic science is a science of much likeness to sanitary science; and its laws are violable with as little impunity. Yet no one ever complains that neglect of cleanliness causes disease; and no one ought to complain of political economy, because it points out the true—sometimes, perhaps, the difficult—road to good results; good, first commercially, and ultimately, like good sanitary results, favourable to perfect morals.

B.

ST. LUKE AND THE LXX.

SIR,—Is it credible that a well educated Gentile Christian, who had lived for years at the side of St. Paul, constantly hearing his instruction to Jews and Jewish Christians both in public and in private, and constantly conversing with him about the relations between Judaism and Christianity, could avoid becoming very familiar with the Septuagint?

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, December 2nd, 1890.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE OF THE ASCENSION.

SIR,—You published, some considerable time ago, a letter of mine on the historical authority for the fact of our Lord's Ascension, in which I spoke of the two accounts by Saint Luke—in his Gospel and in the Acts—as the only information on the subject that we have, rejecting that in the concluding chapter of St. Mark as not being a genuine part of that Gospel. Later study has made me alter this opinion, and I now think that although the last chapter of St. Mark, from the 9th verse to the end, is beyond doubt no part of the original Gospel, but probably added in the place of leaves that were lost; yet it is not put together out of fragments of the other three Gospels, but is an independent tradition, probably as old as the many narratives which St. Luke, in the first verse of his Gospel, mentions as having been already written.

The most remarkable part of the concluding passage of St. Mark is the following :—"And these signs shall follow them that believe ; In My name they shall cast out demons ; they shall speak with new tongues ; they shall take up serpents ; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them ; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover"—verses 17, 18.

When the conclusion is accepted that this is not part of the Gospel as written by Mark, the disciple of Peter, it is an obvious suggestion that the saying about taking up serpents has been suggested by the fact of St. Paul throwing a viper off his hand at Melita (Acts xxviii. 5), and that the promise to be protected against poison has no authority at all : for no instance of such preservation is on record. Such was my belief formerly, but it has been changed, chiefly by comparing this with what is in fact, though not in form, a parallel passage, namely, Luke x. 19. When the seventy messengers returned to Jesus, saying, "Lord, even the demons are subject to us in thy name," He said to them, "Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy ; and nothing shall in any wise hurt you." This is obviously an allusion to Ps. xci. 13 : "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder ; the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet." This would be understood literally by the disciples, and though the Lord no doubt had a spiritual meaning in those words (as is evident from the previous words, "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven"), yet it seems unreasonable to exclude the literal and more obvious meaning. I conclude then that Mark xvi. 17, 18, no less than Luke x. 19, is a genuine saying of our Lord. Instead of thinking that the saying about taking up serpents was suggested by the miracle wrought by St. Paul at Melita, I now think it more likely that the working of that miracle was suggested to St. Paul by remembering those words of the Lord ; though this is only a guess, and of little importance were it certain. And although no instance of miraculous preservation from poison is recorded, there is no reason why it may not have occurred. Had the concluding chapters of the Acts been lost, we should have no instance of such preservation from serpents.

The concluding passage of St. Mark also says (v. 19) that "the Lord Jesus sat down at the right hand of God." This is not in either of the accounts of the Ascension by Saint Luke, and it could not be actually seen by the disciples, but it was no doubt revealed to them either by the Lord in conversation before His Ascension, or by the Holy Spirit afterwards, as the fulfilment of Ps. cx. 1 : "Jehovah saith unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." This doctrine became part of the Apostolic teaching and the Christian creed, as we learn from Acts vii. 56, where Stephen says, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God" (standing up, as Chrysostom remarks, to welcome His martyr into heaven) ; also from 1 Peter iii. 22 : "Who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven" ; and Hebrews viii. 1 : "We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens."

On the whole, it seems most likely that the passage which has been appended to the Gospel of St. Mark is of the Apostolic period, and perfectly trustworthy.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, November 30th, 1890.

THE LAMP AND THE OLIVE-TREES.

A Suggestion for a Picture.

(See Zechariah iv.).

Two olive-trees upon the left and right ;
And in the midst a golden lamp is seen,
Bearing seven flames of whitest ray serene,
Which fill the space between the trees with light;
Beyond them and above, the starry night.
Leftward beside the lamp the Prophet stands,
With tablet and with pencil in his hands ;
And, on the other side, an angel bright,
Who comes, a message from his God to bring,
Standing beneath the boughs with folded wing :
And this is what he bids the Prophet write ;
"Not by the power of man, nor earthly pride,
The oil that lights the nations is supplied
But by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Might."

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Missionary societies have been active this week in Oxford. The S.P.G. held its annual meeting on Thursday, the 27th ult., in the Town-hall, the Bishop of the diocese presiding. The speakers were (besides the Bishop, who gave an interesting historical sketch of the work of the society) the Rev. E. Crompton, of Algoma, and the Rev. Deane Cowan, of Madagascar. There was a very good attendance of the local clergy. At a meeting of the Ladies' Association in connection with the society, held in the previous week, the Rev. Dr. Pope, teacher of Telugu in the University, who was the chief speaker, urged strenuously the formation of a Sisterhood, or central home, in which ladies desirous of undertaking missionary work in foreign parts might be trained and instructed for their work. At present while there was much zeal there was also much mis-directed energy, because those who engaged in the work often engaged in it without any previous instruction at all, without even being acquainted with the language which they would have to use as the medium of their teaching. Each year the part played by women in missionary work was being recognised as more important ; with the growing recognition of its importance should come an improvement in the machinery by which it may be made efficient and successful. Next Tuesday there is to be a public meeting in support of the Central African Mission in the Hall of Wadham, the chief speaker at which will be Archdeacon Chauncy Maples.

Schinos.—A friend writes as follows :—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous ; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beardmore, Rev. H. L., M.A., Perpetual Curate of the Chapel Royal, Brighton.
Birkett, Rev. F. J., M.A., Rector of St. Andrew's, Chichester.
Bolton, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Sithney, Cornwall; Vicar of Saltash.
Braithwaite, Rev. Francis Gretton Coleridge, M.A., lately Curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Munster-square; Rector of Baverstock, Wilts.
Browne, Rev. J. J., M.A., Vicar of Sutton Cheney, Le cestershire.
Chadwick, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of Thornhill Lees; Rural Dean.
Davey, Rev. H. M., M.A., Rural Dean of Boxgrove, Division I.
De Heriz, Rev. F. L. Vane, B.A., Rector of St. Martin-by-Loo; Rector of Nether Whitacre, near Birmingham.
Dougherty, Rev. John A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Australia*.
Dyke, Rev. Perceval Hart, M.A., Rector of Compton Abbas, Dorset; Rural Dean of Sturminster Newton Portion of the Shaftesbury Deanery.
Farrow, Rev. J. W., Chaplain of the Swinton Industrial Schools.
Fitzgerald, Rev. William George, Rural Dean of the district of Bridgwater.
Fryer, Rev. C. G., Lynn, Vicar of Rumburgh, Suffolk; Rector of Coston-with-Runhall, Norfolk.
Gaussen, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Curate of Bedminster, with Charge of St. Michael and All Angels' Mission District; Chaplain to the Liverpool Seamen's Orphan Institution.
Harding, Rev. E. Elmer, M.A., Vice-Principal of Lichfield Theological College; Principal of St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead.
Hayden, Rev. J. A., M.A., Organising Secretary of the National Society for the North-West District.
Hayward, Rev. T. G. T., M.A., Dean's Vicar; Sub-Chanter of Lichfield Cathedral.
Henderson, Rev. James, M.A., Rector of Wallsend; Honorary Canon of Newcastle Cathedral.
Herbert, Rev. G. Nicholas, M.A., Rector of Cowlam, Sledmere, York; Vicar of St. John de Sepulchre, Norwich.
Jennings, Rev. Edward Linck, M.A., Vicar of Up Hatherly; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Cheltenham.
Jones, Rev. P. S. P., Vicar of Scraptoft, Leicester.
Long, Rev. Henry Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Bamburgh; Honorary Canon of Newcastle Cathedral.
Markham, Rev. Arthur, M.A., British Chaplain St. Malo-with-Paramé, France.
Meade-King, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Rural Dean of the district of Quantoxhead.
Mount, Ven. Archdeacon, M.A., Rural Dean of Chichester.
Nicholl, Rev. C. S., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Matthias's, Liverpool; Vicar of Christ Church, Streatham.
Norman, Rev. William Eglesfield Bathurst, M.A., Vicar of Biddenham, Bedford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beadon, Rev. Richard à Court, M.A., Prebendary of Wells, at Heronslade, Warminster, on the 30th ult., aged 81.
Evans, Rev. J. J., Vicar of Llanyre, Abbey-cwm-Hir and Llanvihangel Helygan, at Llanyre, Llandrindod, Radnorshire, on the 22nd ult., in his 73rd year.
Foster, Rev. Sir Cavendish Hervey, Bart., of Glyde Court, Ardee, County Louth, Ireland, at Upper Swell Rectory, on the 27th ult., aged 73.
Frere, Rev. Henry Temple, for thirty-six years Rector of Burston, at Burston Rectory, on the 26th ult., aged 69.
Isham, Rev. Robert, Rector of Lamport, at Lamport, on the 26th ult.
Jarratt, Rev. John, M.A., Canon of York Minster, and for sixty years the Vicar of North Cave, at North Cave, Yorkshire, on the 30th ult., aged 91.
Lowndes, Rev. Charles, Rector of Hartwell, Aylesbury, on the 27th ult., aged 81.
Maskell, Rev. John, A.K.C., formerly Curate-in-Charge of All Hallows, Barking, and for twenty-one years Master and Chaplain of Emanuel Hospital, and many years Assistant-Priest at St. James-the-Less, Westminster, at Emanuel Hospital, Westminster, on Advent Sunday, aged 61.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

OF JESUS CHRIST EATING AND DRINKING.

By the Rev. Canon DWYER, A.M.

Sermon Preached in Burnham Parish Church, Somerset, on Sunday, November 2nd, 1890.

"But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children."—St. Matthew xi. 16-19.

OUR Lord having borne testimony to John the Baptist, adds the words you have just heard read, and in them vindicates Himself and the Baptist from unjust censures, also lays down rules in the matter of eating and drinking, and on opinions passed thereupon. For this purpose, He uses an apt illustration taken from child-life in Palestine. In the sunny piazzas of some town, He had noticed the petulant behaviour of "the children in the market-place." One set, or band of these, were bent on playing at weddings, and had provided music and a merry joyous dance as part of their play, and they asked the other set present to join their party in all this. These latter disdained the invitation. But when again these latter, although the "fellows" or playmates of the former, made another move to get up a grand solemn performance of a funeral with mourners to "keen" or chaunt, found themselves refused and balked in turn. There is a third set mentioned as distinct from these two impracticable and censorious projectors. These are "the children of wisdom" who are so called, because they "justify wisdom," or prove themselves possessed of the qualities and able to exemplify the conduct belonging to "wisdom." The manner in which the Lord's own habitual course of action in respect of eating and drinking was commented upon and grossly censured may be first taken up. He says, "The son of man came eating and drinking (in a simple, natural way, like any other religious and self-respecting man);" and they say, "Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber (and worse still), a friend of publicans and sinners." Then, again, another set or band or company of adult people were equally unjust and calumnious against poor "John the Baptist," and had nothing better or kinder to say of him than—"He hath a devil." And yet Jesus bare witness to John as a prophet, and none "born of a woman greater." So in like manner, John, when he heard of the miracles, life and doctrine of Jesus, acknowledged Him as none else and none less than the Messiah—The Lamb of God—spotless and perfect, "who taketh away the sins of the world." Now, let us ask, why was it that the Lord Jesus was a moderate man in eating and in drinking, and why John was what we call a total abstainer and almost a vegetarian perhaps?

The answer is this: 1st, Jesus acted so, as a testimony and protest against the practices of the Essenes and the false philosophy of the East. This is evident from his first miracle in Cana of Galilee. This sect and this philosophy were more or less founded upon the false opinion that there were two Deities—one good, who made mind, the other, bad, who made matter. And accordingly in this first miracle the Lord purposely came in conflict with the three forms in which these two fundamental errors showed themselves. First, He beautified by His presence and honoured with a miracle, the grand primæval institution of marriage at some poor plain home in Cana of Galilee; secondly, this miracle consisted in making wine, real and "good" too, in order to afford a sufficient supply of wine on the festive occasion. Let me add here that the Marcionite heretics afterwards cut this miracle out of their sectarian edition of the Gospels. The third monstrous evil He also repudiated and prophetically censured was the honour and worship of an inferior or second-rate kind of deities (Æons they were called), such as the blessed Virgin Mary is now exalted into by some. So, again we ask, why did John the Baptist live as we have seen? John coming in the spirit and power of the great patriot and prophet Elijah conformed his life to a model of stern severity as his testimony against the abounding luxury and God-denying sensuality of his age. Is there any sane Christian who will say that Jesus was wrong? or, will add, that it is wrong of us to follow His steps in this way, as our Perfect Exemplar? or, that the wine he made by miracle was not real wine? Will any sane man again say that John the Baptist was wrong in this action of his, or that his motive was morose, malignant, false and devilish? Any one who so affirms, or so contends, at once puts himself into the ranks of the one or the other of the two lots of "the children in the market-place," because swayed by prejudice and soured by a dominating and dictatorial spirit. A Christian is not wrong in using God's creatures thankfully and temperately. And any who says he is wrong condemns of necessary consequence Him who was absolute perfection, infinite wisdom, and love supreme, all in one, and who came to seek and to save that which was lost and give His life a ransom for many.

Again, to put the matter fairly on both sides (for I would be unworthy of occupying this place were I unfair, one-sided, or sophistical), if any man thinks that he can do more good—I will not say to himself—in a violent wrench from a temptation to him irresistible, but rather for the sake of others, will any one say—I mean any Christian—that he is wrong, and is a morose fool and a malignant designer? The man who passes this sentence on his fellow is only a child in the market-place, and a fool for his pains, and, if he could, a dictatorial tyrant. But that we may the better grasp the two sides of this question, and reach down to the very root of the matter, I now ask you to follow me in some reflections upon the sentiments and action of St. Paul in the matter even of eating and drinking things offered to idols, that is, wine and flesh-meat. Of this he treats in the 8th chapter of the First Epistle to Corinthians. He has left also something bearing on this point in the 14th and 15th of Romans. Bear in mind that both here and all along there are two distinct questions—first as to acting, and second as to judging about our own and other people's actions.

How did St. Paul then act, and how deal with an interference of others by hostile judgments passed on his actions? First, in 1 Corinthians viii. 8, he lays it down that this in itself is an indifferent matter, and as such it is obligatory, not from an external law binding all, as "Thou shalt not kill," but only as a matter of individual and internal sense of responsibility. Such is its law and its sole law too. "Meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better, nor if we eat not are we the worse." Secondly, in chap. ix., verse 3, he says, "Mine answer to them that examine me is this, Have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, a Christian wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? So, under vow, celibacy, and total abstinence go together. Then, thirdly, as to the assumed right of any to pass these intimidating, intrusive censures on others, he says, in Rom. xiv. 4, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth. (Then he adds significantly in reference to any holding out of threats or terrors of reprobation and the like) For God is able to make him stand," even though he may so eat and drink. Again in 1 Cor. x. 29, he says, in harmony with the former decision, "Conscience, I say not thine own but of the other, for, why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience." Now we have to find out how St. Paul did not do, what he had a perfect right of doing, and why so? Well, he tells this in the two Epistles. In Rom. xiv. 13, he says "Let us not judge one another any more, but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or occasion to fall in his brother's way." Then in verse 21 he adds, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor (do) anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." Then in verse 13 of 1 Cor. viii. he sums up his own decision as to his own acting, or rather not acting, in the matter under review. Thus, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."

All this makes it clear as the day at noon, that as our Lord did eat and drink, and as John the Baptist did not eat and drink in the usual manner, and as St. Paul claimed the right to act either way, as he himself alone saw fit and thought right for himself, so we may now draw our conclusion on the whole question.

What is the conclusion? It is this. First, in reference to the matter itself, to be eaten or drunken, "every creature of God is good," and "God hath given us all things, richly to enjoy, as a kind Father." Secondly, whether any one or everyone so enjoys these, or does not so enjoy them, is his or her own sole affair, and none else has the right to put in his oar, or give his judgment on the choice made accordingly. If any or many do this, it is an intrusion, an invasion, and the violation of the right of private judgment, and of the individuality of man as a man, as well as a Christian. But then, above all, as these individual rights may or may not be foregone by the individual, with no right of any other mortal man to pass judgment this way or that, by saying, "This one is a drunkard that one is a devil." So, this right of choice must be, if not by man with his fellows, yet by God over his creatures, made the subject matter of a searching and final award on the great day of judgment. For is it not written in Rom. xiv. 12 in reference to this very point: "So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God."

Here, therefore, we are landed in this conclusion, if we take Scripture for our guide, that total abstinence, and moderate use of what we eat or drink, are alike optional with each individual; common sense and charity teach the same.

Now this is precisely the double plank in the platform of the Church of England Temperance Society, of which I learn, there is a branch in this Diocese. May we then, by God's grace, be in this and in all things, "the children of wisdom," and leave "the children of the market place" to their endless janglings and obvious masterfulness over the consciences of their fellows. But, there is a great deal more and worse than mere sound and fussy confusion and uncharity to come of all this. It is from just this ill-constituted and ill-directed and blind enthusiasm that has arisen the greatest tyranny and oppression that ever conflicted with civil and religious liberty, in Church alike as in State.

Beginning with dictating to the individual in things indifferent, it soon lords it uncontrolled over the whole body of Christian people in things not

indifferent, and ends with finding a sanction for its domination, by proclaiming itself infallible to judge and supreme to enforce.

How sad and how curious, that priestcraft, in its most repulsive excesses, began in amiable efforts to amend society and expel excess. In all these points, "wisdom is justified by her children," who will ever recognise fundamental rights and confine themselves to divinely appointed means. And be content with "the old ways." For, the old ways having the clear sanctions of divine instruction and the illustrations of experience, are most assuredly the safest to follow after all, anything to the contrary notwithstanding.

CHRIST THE MANIFESTATION OF GOD.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Warrenpoint.

Sermon Preached at Warrenpoint.

"Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us."—St. John xiv. 8.

THERE are two stages in our religious experience; the first when there breaks on the soul, however dimly, the felt need of God: "I want God"; the second when later on there comes as a natural result from this, the knowledge, "God wants me; I have a place in His kingdom, work to do for Him." The request of Philip, startling though it sounds, arose naturally from the words of Jesus. He had just been uttering some of the deep truths of His doctrine, preparing the minds of the disciples for the awful scenes with which His mission was to close. They did not understand His meaning. He told them of a home with many mansions, and they were full of dreams of an earthly kingdom; He had spoken to them of impending separation, and they were full of anticipated triumph. Then He spoke to them of His Father; they knew He referred to God, and it may be there was in this cry of Philip something of this spirit—"If we are to believe, in God, cannot you, who live in such nearness to Him, give us such an evidence of His existence, such a manifestation, as may save us from ever doubting again? Shew us the Father." It does not seem to us unnatural; nay, there is a certain lofty ring about the request which more than half blinds us to the unbelief and slowness to apprehend Christ which underlies it, for surely there is a sadness of reproach in the reply of Jesus—the surprise of one who can hardly realise such slowness of comprehension on the part of those who lived with Him and beheld His glory, "the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." To see Him was to see the Father, to comprehend Him was to see God manifested in self-sacrifice and in love; yet this cry of Philip is one that we may well dwell upon as representing the cry of humanity, ever since the birth of human thought. Eliphaz the Temanite spoke wisely when he said, "Acquaint now thyself with Him and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee" (Job xxii. 21). But alas there was also truth, bitter truth, in the wail wrung from Job: "O that I knew where I might find Him, that I might come even to His seat; I would order my cause before Him, and fill my mouth with arguments; I would know the words which He would answer me, and understand what He would say unto me" (Job xxiii. 2-5). "Behold I go forward but He is not there, and backward but I cannot perceive Him; on the left hand where He doth work but I cannot behold Him; He hideth Himself on the right hand that I cannot see Him" (xxiii. 8-9). To men like David "the heavens declared the glory of God and the firmament shewed His handiwork." In moments of sublime ecstasy Isaiah might cry, "O that thou wouldest rend the heavens and come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence" (Is. lxiv. 1). But when trouble came, when doubts clouded the soul and obscured the faith, then Job's cry was the cry of humanity, "O that I knew where I might find Him"; "Shew us the Father."

Let us know does God care for us; let us have some certainty that we are not the puppets of blind chance, but that the Creator cares for us and is interested in our welfare. This cry of the soul lies at the root of all religion. But how shall we answer it? Is there any answer possible? If only we can meet this deep craving in our souls, surely we may be persuaded that He that satisfieth the desire of every living thing, will also satisfy man's yearning for a fuller and higher life. We shall glance at three lines of thought: (1) God manifested in nature; (2) God manifested in Providence; (3) God manifested in Christ.

1. Nature is the voice of God, and when she declares anything to be fact her declaration is as much a revelation as the disclosures of the Bible. It was the same hand traced "the marble tablets of the hills" that traced the mystic tables of Sinai. Erroneous views on this subject led to the scandals connected with Galileo, who was forced to sign a paper that the proposition "that the sun is the centre of the universe and immovable from its place is absurd, philosophically false, and formally heretical"; and to the outcry against Columbus who was assailed by quotations from Genesis to the Epistles in order to disprove the existence of America. How came man to have any conception of God? Did he derive the idea from nature alone? From Thales downwards men have believed in a great First Cause, but their foolish minds have been darkened, so that while from the things that are clearly seen they reasoned up to the invisible, even to "His eternal power and Godhead"; yet five centuries B.C. this knowledge only led Xerxes as far as a belief in the spirit dwelling in the sea, which having dared

to break his bridge must be scourged like a slave and cowed into subjection. "The world by wisdom knew not God." Yet nature did reveal Him to those who had eyes to see Him. Thus to the Psalmist nature revealed God, "The heavens declare the glory of God." And what shall we say to whom modern science has revealed new worlds, and opened up systems which in those days were entirely unknown. Modern science tells us that the sun which lights up our world gives light and heat to numerous worlds larger and more glorious than the earth we dwell upon; that our world when compared with them is insignificant; that if our earth, with all its teeming, life were to-morrow blotted out of existence, it would be but the disappearance of one unit from the vast field of being. And outside the planetary system which has limits, what shall we say? There are only five or six of the planetary worlds visible to the naked eye; those stars are attached to the sun and circle round him; but outside that circle, again, we find stars that own no influence of his, and shine with no borrowed radiancy. They are immeasurably distant; if this earth moving in its orbit a million and a-half miles per day were hurled through space at the same velocity, it would not have covered the immense space between us and them within the time stated to have passed since Creation. Such systems to be visible so far must be of vast size and vaster brilliancy. And science with unerring precision tells us that each is a sun lighting up innumerable worlds. The number of the stars is as the sand of the seashore; "the unassisted eye of man can take in a thousand, and the best telescope which the genius of man has constructed, can take in eighty millions." And as our earth with other orbs moves round the sun, so again it is more than probable that the sun, with all his worlds, moves round some greater light and obeys some higher mechanism. Whence came these worlds? Who made them? Who upholds them? Well may we ask, "Lord, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou so regardest him?" Did these things come into being by chance? Are they upheld in their courses by chance? Science tells us they are governed by definite laws that never vary. Were the laws the outcome of chance or design? But then science says, "These vast worlds show that God may be in existence, but they also prove that the world cannot perish without all nature being uprooted.

Brethren, there is another side to science. The microscope tells us of innumerable worlds in every leaf, and every drop of water. Can these perish and their occupiers be annihilated and still the system remain? And in the vast universe of being, what is our world more than a drop in the ocean of existence!

Does not Nature tell us that there is a God; that in the vast concerns of the universe He finds time to paint the lily, and to mould with exquisite grace the wing of the moth, and to feed the young of the sparrow!

Shall we believe that such a work as the Forth Bridge did not come into existence by chance, but is the result of design, and that design involves a designer; and shall we see no traces of design in the universe, and no necessity for a supreme mind to conceive the details, and carry them into execution when conceived? Shall we believe that every leaf constitutes a world teeming with life—every drop of water an ocean swarming with living occupants—that from man downwards there stretches a long series of created beings of different orders; and shall we deny that there extends another series upwards till it reaches its climax in God?

Whatever may be thought of Darwin's speculations the closing words of "The Origin of Species" deserve consideration coming from such a source:

"There is grandeur in this view of life with its several powers having been originally *breathed by the Creator* into a few forms or into one; and that whilst this planet has gone cycling on, according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms, most beautiful, and most wonderful have been and are being evolved."

Has the Creator who made all things well given man *the religious instinct*—the craving for immortality—merely to mock him with vain hope? Man looks into the broken mirror of his own moral and spiritual consciousness, and finds there a reflection of God.

True the mirror is broken and reflects a distorted picture, but every animal suits its surroundings and its longings are satisfied therein; shall man seek God and never find Him?

2. We turn to question Providence, that is, the system under which the world is governed.

Again science comes forward and states that the world is governed by law.

What is Law? Is it an invariable sequence of cause and effect? But how came the causes into existence? And now being existent do the laws that govern the world never vary? Let us see.

The universal consent of mankind goes to prove the existence of will. Doctors say that often death is averted or hastened by the failure of a person to exert will or by the energy of its exertion; that often insanity is averted by the exercise of will. It is proved that when the Spaniards conquered Peru, and the English conquered Tasmania, the people died off from heartbreak, and thus the laws of nature were set aside by the interposition of another law, the human will. And if so, then *à priori*, the same laws may be subject to modification and control, by the great will of the Supreme Architect.

In fine, law is only the manifestation of the will of God. Take the manifestation of Deity in Nature and in Providence, and compare it with that of Revelation, and you find a marvellous unity pervading all. Let me take an illustration.

Our Lord said: 'Whosoever shall give one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, he shall in no wise lose his reward." Here is a law expressly laid down as the rule of Providence. Can you not read there the love of that Father whom Christ came to reveal? Just think of Him registering in heaven the little acts of kindness, the courteous words that cost nothing, yet mean so much to the souls weary and wounded in the battle of life. And tell me, is not that law a manifestation of the God who heareth the cry of the young ravens, and feedeth the sparrows and clotheth the earth with verdure and maketh it glad with rain and sunshine? And thus we may learn that God interferes and guides all things. But what more? What are His rules—His sympathies —His feelings—His intentions towards mankind? And again there is no answer that satisfies. He maketh His sun to shine on the evil and the good, on the insect, and the man, on all alike. And so men cried, "Oh that I knew where I might find Him!" Now then, brethren, we answer that appeal. Man could not find Him, but He came and sought out the lost world, and gave an avenue of reconciliation to the fallen nature of man.

3. "Shew us the Father." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

Seen in Nature, God is terrible; for we are overpowered by the far reaching wisdom, and all embracing majesty of His sway. The knowledge is too wonderful for us. But seen in Christ the view of God sufficeth us for all needs. We see His holiness and His love, His tenderness and self-sacrifice. His infinite compassion for sinners, and His infinite hatred of sin, His power and purity, and His all embracing, yearning love. And it sufficeth us. Hence we learn that God is *a Person*, not a law nor system, that He is touched with our sufferings, that when we suffer we do not suffer alone, that when we die, we do not die unnoticed, that after death "we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."

Brethren, has Christ been so long time with you and yet have you not known Him, never felt His influence, never bowed before His authority, never felt the beauty of His life or the influence of His Spirit?

Are you wailing to-day, "Shew us the Father"? He is here, has been with you, and you knew Him not. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. Christ is God, therefore you may be assured of the reality of the reconciliation.

At morn I prayed, "I fain would see
How three are one and one is three;
Read the dark riddle unto me."

I wandered forth; the sun and air
I saw bestowed with equal care
On good and evil, foul and fair.

No partial favour dropped the rain;
Alike the righteous and profane
Rejoiced above their heading grain.

And my heart murmured, "Is it meet
That blindfold nature thus should trea
With equal hand the tares and wheat?"

A presence melted through my mood,
A warmth, a light, a sense of good,
Like sunshine through a winter wood

I saw that presence, mailed complete
In her white innocence, pause to greet
A fallen sister on the street.

Upon her bosom snowy pure
The lost one clung, as if secure
From inward guilt, or outward lure.

"Beware!" I said; "in this I see
No gain to her, but loss to thee:
Who touches pitch defiled must be."

I passed the haunts of shame and sin,
And a voice whispered, "Who therein
Shall these lost souls to Heaven's peace win?

"Who there shall hope and health dispense,
And lift the ladder up from thence
Whose rounds are prayers of penitence?"

I said, "No higher life they know;
These earthworms love to have it so;
Who stoops to raise them sinks as low."

That night with painful care I read
What Hippo's saint and Calvin said—
The living seeking to the dead!

In vain I turned in weary quest,
Old pages, where (God give them rest!)
The poor creed-mongers dreamed and guessed.

And still I prayed, "Lord, let me see
How three are one, and one is three;
Read the dark riddle unto me."

Then something whispered, "Dost thou pray
For what thou hast? This very day
The holy three have crossed thy way.

"Did not the gifts of sun and air
To good and ill alike, declare
The all-compassionate Father's care?

"In the white soul that stooped to raise
The lost one from her evil ways
Thou saw'st the Christ, whom angels praise!

"A bodiless Divinity,
The still small voice that spake to thee
Was the Holy Spirit's mystery!

"O blind of sight, of faith how small;
Father, and Son, and Spirit Call;
This day thou hast denied them all!

"Revealed in love and sacrifice,
The Holiest passed before thine eyes,
One and the same, in three-fold guise.

"The equal Father in rain and sun,
His Christ in the good to evil done,
His voice in thy soul—and the Three are One."

I shut my grave Aquinas fast,
The monkish gloss of ages past,
The school worn creed aside I cast.

And my heart answered, "Lord, I see
How three are one and one is three—
Thy riddle hath been read to me."

"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXIX. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1890.

WHAT IS THE BENEFIT OF PRIVATE ABSOLUTION?

(*From an Irish Correspondent.*)

AS the question of confession and absolution, private and public, is now one of great interest, it seems seasonable to say a few words on the subject.

The power of absolution is founded on our Lord's words (John xx. 23), "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," etc. This form, preceded by the solemn act of breathing on the Apostles, and the words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost"—it is pretended, was no peculiar commission to the Apostles and their successors, but merely a direction to all present, men and women, to make known the Gospel offer of mercy. That our Lord should commission all Christians, women and men, to retain, as well as remit sins, seems incredible. During His lifetime, our Lord ordained (St. Mark) or sent forth (St. Matthew) the twelve.

Afterwards He appointed seventy others (St. Luke). Now is it conceivable that our Lord would breathe on people, say receive ye the Holy Ghost, as He had Himself had at His Baptism, that ye may have power to remit and retain sins; and that He should only mean that all men, women and children, should read to others the offers of mercy in the Gospel? This idea is absurd.

The form in Morning and Evening Prayer is highly commended, as more safe than that rejected, which used to stand in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, being, as it was, founded on our Lord's express words to His Apostles. But what says that preferred form? "He hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." Who can suppose that, when the priest tells the people that he has received that power, he means only "as each of you, men, women, and children have received it"?

This is what we are gravely told was all that our Lord meant, when He breathed on the Apostles, gave them the power of the Holy Ghost, and authority to remit and retain sins. Let who will believe this. I know no sect so ignorant as to say this. It is reserved for a section of our own clergy. But here I may be asked, have the clergy power to forgive sins? I answer not, and neither had the Apostles, though our Lord addressed these words to them. No one can forgive sins but God only. None can read hearts but God only. If there be any in England or Ireland who say that no sins are forgiven unless they be privately enumerated to the priest and by him pardoned, I teach not so, neither does the Prayer-book. If it did, it would call on all to come for private absolution. But she does not. She says, "if any of you cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word." One who hath authority to speak in God's name, "and open his grief, that, by the ministry of God's Holy Word, he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding all scruple and doubtfulness."

You will observe that absolution is one thing. "Ghostly counsel and advice" is another. A man is supposed unable to quiet his own conscience, but requiring further comfort, or assurance, such as absolution confers, as also counsel for his future life. It is said that the minister of God's Word is merely to advise out of the Bible, and that that is what is meant by "the ministry of God's Holy Word." But this is a mistake. The ministry of God's Holy Word means the ministry, with which we are intrusted by God's Holy Word. All may read the Gospel to one another. The ministry of absolution is that office committed to us by God's Holy Word, or the ministry, or use, of that special Word of our Lord, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." All are not summoned to receive private absolution. God's pardon is not made dependent on *that*. If so, the duty would be imposed on all. The gift to be bestowed is not pardon, but the man's certainty that he has already attained it. It is the man who is in doubt of himself that is invited. A man, suppose, like Cowper the poet, has heard and read all the invitations and promises in the Gospel, and yet thinks that there is no mercy for him. How is he to be assured? By the Gospel being read to him? He has heard and read it all. Its words and offers are general. He wants an assurance to himself as

an individual. This is what our Lord commissioned His clergy to convey. To suppose that every man, woman or child, can thus speak with authority is absurd and monstrous.

But then it may be asked, how can the clergyman say with authority you are pardoned? He does so, only, on condition that the applicant is sincere, penitent, minded to reform, and trusting solely on God's mercy in Christ. So the man must judge of his own sincerity. It may be said that the applicant was supposed not to be fit to judge of his own sincerity. Not so! What he was incapable of judging of was God's mind towards him. The clergyman, having received satisfactory answers, may say, as surely as you truly describe your state, I tell you that you may be as sure that you are pardoned, as if you heard your pardon sound from God Himself. But all depends on your own sincere description of your feelings. Absolution, pronounced by those authorised by Christ, has a quasi-sacramental character, though not a character equal to that of the two great sacraments, having no outward means.

So says the XXI. Homily, p. 298, "Although absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sins yet, by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands . . . and therefore absolution is no such sacrament as Baptism and Communion are."

Cranmer was one of those who drew up this Exhortation in the Prayer-book. Let us, then, hear what he says elsewhere in his sermon of the authority of the keys. "When a man, after Baptism, hath grievously sinned and doubted in his conscience whether he be in the favour of God or not (as oftentimes it happeneth), then it is hard for him to trust to his own bare imaginations, thinking on this fashion: 'I know that I have sinned, but yet I am in the opinion that God is not so cruel a revenger but that He hath forgiven me.' For such an opinion without God's Word is not a true faith, nor is able to stand in the dangerous skirmishes of temptation. But true faith must ever be stayed upon the certain word and work of God. Now God doth not speak to us with a voice sounding out of heaven; but He hath given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the authority to forgive sin to the ministers of the Church. Therefore, let him that is a sinner go to one of them. Let him acknowledge and confess his sin, and pray him that, according to God's commandment, he will give him absolution, and comfort him with the word of grace and forgiveness of his sins. And, when the minister doth so, then I ought steadfastly to believe that my sins are truly forgiven me in heaven. And such a faith is able to stand strong in all skirmishes and assaults of our mortal enemy, the devil; forasmuch as it is builded upon a sure rock, that is, upon the certain word and work of God. For he that is absolved knoweth for a surety that his sins be forgiven by the minister. And he knoweth assuredly also that the minister hath authority from God Himself so to do. And, thirdly, he knoweth that God hath made this promise to His ministers, and said to them, 'To whom ye forgive sins upon earth, to him also they shall be forgiven in heaven.'"

Of course I need scarcely say that Cranmer, no more than I, thought that a priest can forgive, but only that he can authoritatively declare a past forgiveness, unreasonably doubted of. Further, Cranmer, as well as I, would say that strict examination must precede the declaration, and that any deceit on the man's part would make it null. Such is Cranmer's judgment as to absolution, its force, and its appointed minister. As he helped to draw up the words in the Prayer-book, we can see how little authority those have who say that our Lord's words to His Apostles gave them no power to say more than any other Christian may say. There is another idea, very unreasonable, that the absolution spoken of in the old form, now rejected, in the Visitation of the Sick, was an absolution from Church censures. To expose this absurd idea, all I need say is, that such absolution could never be pronounced except in the Bishops' Court, much less by every discreet or learned minister.

In conclusion, the enemies of Church principles, or Sacramentalism, as they are pleased to call it, are not consistent. *Now* they tell us that our Lord's formula of orders is very innocent, for it means nothing. Uttered with all the pomp and circumstance of breathing, and "receive the Holy Ghost, and whosoever sins," etc., we are told that all this means only that men, women, and children are to repeat to one another the Gospel promises. Well, but so did not our Deforming Revision Synod, which Archdeacon Lee called a "Synodus Latronum," so did not *it* take the words of commission, repeated after our Lord, by the ordaining bishops. In the presence of our bishops, judges, and heads of our University, our Lord's words used by our bishops were called the *fons et origo mali.*

Well would it have been if, like our great Queen, speaking of another form, the Synod had said, "He was the Word that spake it. In what sense He spake it. In that sense I take it." But no! Away with the words! They are not fit to live! Like the Jewish king, they would have cut them out and burnt them in the winter palace. After these blasphemous words, worthy of Voltaire, or Julius the Apostate, we read of no rending of garments, though a few made supplication that the words should not be cut out and burnt. May He remember it to them in that day! How, then, did our Lord's words escape the fire? A wise man, Sir Joseph Napier, preferring policy to party theology, assured the Synod that, if we struck out our Lord's words, the English Church

would be shut against us. And so the Irish Church escaped the blasphemous sentence, that our Lord's words are to be struck out, as the *fons et origo mali.* It is evident that, neither in religion nor politics, is Ireland fit to stand independent of England.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." December, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

PROFESSOR BENNETT'S paper on the Old Testament and the New Reformation seems to us not only the most interesting, but also the most valuable in this month's *Expositor.* It reminds, quaintly and truly, of the abiding use of the Old Testament to supply what the paper almost calls the defects of the New Testament. For instance, it makes more prominent the secular side of life: a Lancashire man would say the *homely* side. Also it is more cheerful and more hopeful than the New Testament. But in this last instance we are bound to admit that some of the arguments savour a little of special pleading; still the paper, as a whole, is bright and thoughtful.

The result of Prof. Beet's many papers on Future Punishment is that "the writers of the New Testament agree to teach that the doom of those who persist in refusing the salvation offered by Christ is utter and hopeless and final ruin." From this thought, says the Professor, "we will fly for refuge, and we shall find refuge in the infinite love of our Father in heaven." This may almost be called an appeal from Philip sober to Philip hysterical—only the first conclusion is of doubtful sobriety. And how it can be orthodox to say Christ and His apostles teach one doctrine, but God the Father's infinite love reveals another we leave to the Professor himself to decide; all we ask is for no more papers on Eschatology.

Mr. Peyton continues his articles on Christ's Second Temptation, but in rather too rhetorical a style: the Bishop Designate of Worcester continues his Notes on Genesis, and Dr. Plummer his Recollections of Dr. Döllinger.

"ORIGINAL HYMN TUNES." By the Rev. F. W. Davis, Blairgowrie. Price 3s. Coupar Angus: W. Culross and Son.

THESE are a series of twenty-eight hymn tunes composed, with one exception, by Rev. F. W. Davis, whose work extends over several years. They are, on the whole, melodious and well-harmonised, a combination by no means common to their class. Without any approach to the popular air or the refrain which so often verges on light secular songs, there is a brightness about some of them which is very attractive, whilst others are dignified or pathetic in accordance with the words to which they are set. "Bingley" and "Coutances" are specimens of the former, while "Aberavon," "St. Edmund of Canterbury," and "Ouseley" represent the latter to advantage. Here and there we meet with somewhat awkward intervals; but, as a rule, there are no "Love and high notes" to disturb the voluntary choir of ladies. The Index contains a variety of names of persons and places which are, no doubt, "familiar and beloved" to the author. The Dedication—to the late Sir F. A. G. Ouseley, of whom we presume the author might have been a pupil at St. Michael's College, is written in English, Welsh, and Gaelic. The price is prohibitive for the generality of choirs, and it would help to sell the work if it were published in London as well as "N. B."

Amongst the leaves of the above volume we discovered a separate sheet, containing a minor chant, below which was the legend:—"This composition was the offspring of a feeling of horror and regret that the Government of the country had again fallen into the hands of that arch-traitor and mob-orator, Gladstone; of whom it was said by Lord Palmerston, 'He will first ruin his country, and then die in a madhouse (March 21st, 1886). The denouncing of God's anger against traitors is contained in the words of Ps. cix. 6—15." We agree with the writer that "the music is agreeable to the Commination"; but it should be kept apart from the hymn tunes in which *all* can join without any *double entendre*, whereas the "Dirge" must be reserved for good constitutionalists like the readers of the *Pulpit.*

"SONNETS AND OTHER POEMS." By Joseph John Murphy. London: Kegan Paul. 1890.

WE are bound to express our regret at having recently attributed to Mr. Murphy the authorship of a volume of poems, similar in shape and size to the one before us, and also in the *names* of some of the pieces it contained, which misled us, especially as we were assured that they came from his pen. In other respects, however, the two are quite distinct. "Cassiope, etc.," was preceded by a *nom de plume*, contained much that was light and fanciful, and took great liberties with the metre. These "Sonnets," etc. are in need of nothing to preface them beyond the author's name, are "chiefly religious," and show at once not only the practised verse writer, but also a poetic mind which, while respecting the rhythm and sense, has withal a ready flow of words and ideas, which carry on the reader from line to line, and from verse to verse in a natural and easy manner. The subjects chosen, though often familiar, are freshly clad in striking garb. We may mention the "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "The Temptation," and "Pilgrimage" as being of this class. There is one unfortunate exception, not as regards the poetry, but the subject, in Mr. Murphy's collection, however. He eulogises Sister Dora, who, as everyone knows, did not "Go onward from strength to strength increasing, *all* service sweet," as the service of obedience proved that she had not rightly guaged her own will-power. Lessons from "Westminster Abbey" is a very charming little bit, and will interest all who delight in that ancient National Temple, where—

> "Through twilight aisles and arches flows
> A flood of rich and solemn sound;
> Here England's mighty men repose,
> Here England's kings are crowned."

We trust Mr. Murphy's book may be widely read, both in England and Ireland.

"NUNNERY LIFE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND." By Sister Mary Agnes, O.S.B. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1890.

THIS sadly interesting book has been published with the view of warning young people against Ritualistic teaching, which is too often only a stepping-stone to Rome. Our readers, if acquainted with the beautiful

evangelistic addresses of Father Ignatius, will be surprised when they read this work to find that he advises his nuns to read Roman Catholic publications, practises auricular confession, enjoins penances, teaches almost the infallibility of Superiors of convents, and encourages other equally pernicious practices, and teaches fearfully erroneous doctrines. These things are to be deeply deplored, as so many are attracted by Father Ignatius' addresses, to quote a clergyman's words, "His so-called Gospel sermons and orations contain some good metal with which the counterfeit coin is covered and made to pass as genuine." The wish of the author of this publication is that the mistakes of her life may prove a warning to others, and prevent them from taking the step she did. We advise all our readers to obtain the book and read it, and see for themselves how terrible are the strides which Ritualism is making, and that we are really living in very perilous times as to the sad advance of Romanism and Jesuitism, and the building of so many hundreds of Roman Catholic convents and monasteries. We have every reason to believe that the work is genuine and thoroughly truthful.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE LAST ELEVEN VERSES OF ST. MARK.

SIR,—Mr. Murphy's very ingenious letter in your last issue leads me to some further thoughts concerning the present termination of St. Mark's Gospel.

Critics are nearly unanimous in pronouncing the last verses from the ninth to the end of the sixteenth chapter spurious, in the sense of their not being written by the author of the rest of the Gospel. They do not cohere with what precedes, and the last words of which clearly point to a sentence being left unfinished. For the translation "They were afraid" gives no sufficient idea of the original ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, with which the eighth verse closes. "They were dreading" would come much closer in its effect, both in giving the full force of the imperfect ἐφοβοῦντο, and in conveying a hint that the thing which they were dreading ought to have been specified, though even that translation could give no idea of the awkwardness of ending a sentence with the particle γάρ. Of such an ending I can recollect only one other case in the Greek that I have read.

Another proof that the last verses were not written by the author of the rest of the Gospel is the fact, that another attempt to give the Gospel a sufficing termination was made, which Westcott and Hort have preserved in their edition of the Greek Testament. This attempt, worthless in itself, is yet valuable, because it shows that a deficiency was felt to exist. It would never have been made, supposing the Gospel to have been complete.

The last verses, then, being seen not to be the production of the author of the Gospel, it follows that the Gospel cannot have been published during the lifetime of its author; for, had he been alive, even though his autograph might have been accidentally mutilated, he would have been appealed to to complete it again, and we should have had an ending entirely coherent, and not violently interrupted, as now, by a sentence obviously left imperfect.

These circumstances, so far from detracting from the authority of the Gospel, go far to establish its authenticity.

In 2 Tim. we find St. Paul requesting Timothy in urgent terms "Make haste, or give diligence, to come to me quickly"; and he adds, "Take up Mark" (probably on the journey) and bring him with thyself, for he is useful to me for ministration"; for the performance of such services as an imprisoned Apostle, unable to communicate otherwise than by a confidential agent with the outside world, would require. We cannot doubt that Timothy would comply with this request, and that Mark was, therefore, in attendance on St. Paul in his last imprisonment. What more likely than that he should be involved in the Apostle's fate? or, if he survived St. Paul, that he was put to death in his ministration to St. Peter, who, according to all tradition, was martyred at Rome not long after his colleague?

In that case, the previous autograph of the Gospel may either have been broken off in the middle of a sentence by the summons of the executioner, or may have been mutilated by the rough hand of the soldiers who attended him.

Then the very imperfection of the Gospel is corroborative evidence of its high antiquity and probable authorship. C. P. M.

P.S.—That Mark continued at Rome and there ministered to Peter after the death of Paul, in which case he would very likely share Peter's fate, seems to be established by 1 Peter v. 13, if the Babylon mentioned in that chapter be meant for Rome, according to the usage of the Apocalypse.

The tradition that Mark afterwards went to Alexandria and became its first bishop has no sure foundation, and is in itself very unlikely. Is it possible that Alexandria would wait so long for Christianity, especially considering its extensive commercial intercourse with every part of the Roman world! The story was probably got up to enhance the importance of the great Egyptian bishopric by tracing it back to a companion and attendant of St. Peter. C. P. M.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND MORALS.

SIR,—The PULPIT of Saturday contains a letter, with the above heading, signed "B." offering some criticisms on mine, which appeared in the preceding number.

The writer denies that Political Economists are generally agreed as to the paramount importance of labour in the production of wealth. In reply, I beg to quote from some of the most distinguished writers. Adam Smith begins his great work on "The Wealth of Nations" as follows: "The annual labour of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniencies of life which it annually consumes." The French economist, Garnier, said of Smith: "This great man perceived that the universal agent in the creation of wealth is labour." The first words in J. Stuart Mill's work on "Political Economy" are: "The requisites of production are two: labour, and appropriate natural objects." Fawcett, in his "Manual of Political Economy," Book I., Chap. II., says: "The production of every species of wealth requires the application of man's labour." He goes on to remark that coal is not available until dug out by

labour. To this I may add that we cannot have harvests of grain, or any other product of the soil, without labour. "B." says, "A spermaceti whale that has been stranded is worth a large sum." Does he suppose anyone would buy it, unless sure of being able to procure muscular and skilled labour, to draw forth and adapt its useful and valuable properties?

It is stated by "B." that profit-sharing ought not to be recommended except for its commercial advantages. His maxim seems to be, "business is business, and morals are morals; quite distinct." My conviction is, that kindly humanity is an important co-operator for making an industrial undertaking permanently successful. I believe that not only honesty, justice, and benevolence, but also expediency, demand that labourers should have a share in the increase of wealth, obtained through their indispensable agency. That share should be regulated on fair principles for the employers, in view of the fact that they run the risk of losses, while the labourers only run the risk of of not getting profits, as in any case they are to have their wages.

The French seem to have managed the matter in a way that has inspired confidence on the part of labourers, and has been attended with much advantage to employers. Leclaire, of Paris, who was the son of a poor shoemaker, and who, by his intelligence, industry, and energy, established a large industrial institution before he was thirty, was earnestly desirous, from the first, to promote the welfare of his workmen. An enlightened friend suggested to him, in 1835, the grand idea: "The participation of the workman in the profits of the master." He thenceforward applied his mind to devise the best means of bringing this idea into practical operation. At length, in 1842, he announced the initiatory measures, in the midst of great difficulties and much opposition, which soon vanished as the benefits of the system were manifested. In the year 1865, he bore this testimony: "If I had gone on in the beaten track of routine, I could not have arrived, even by fraudulent means, at a position comparable to that which I have made for myself." He died in 1872, but his establishment, called *Maison Leclaire*, has continued in full prosperity. In Mr. Sedley Taylor's book on "Profit Sharing," published in 1884, the results of its business from 1870 to 1882 are given. In the last named year the workpeople received in wages £42,799, and besides that, as their share of profits, £9,630.

My self-consciousness convinces me, that if a man is animated by hope, he will work much more diligently, and with much greater care, than if he has no agreeable prospects to cheer him. He will also be much more likely to be a good husband and father, and to abstain from irregular and intemperate habits. His work will be more faithful and perfect, and his liability to serious negligences, producing fatal accidents and losses, will be greatly diminished. His capacity to purchase manufactured goods, and other conveniences of life, will be increased. Adam Smith said: "Where wages are high, we shall always find the workmen more active, diligent, and expeditious, than where they are low." J. B.

Canonbury, December 8th, 1890.

THE IRRATIONALITY OF RITUALISM.

SIR,—The recent important article in *The Times* of Tuesday, 25th November, on the "Lincoln" Case, with other pronouncements in your own paper and elsewhere of a somewhat different complexion, coupled to the suggestion of a friend, lead me to attempt, in spite of having but little leisure for it, to address to you a few earnest general observations on the subject of what I propose to call the "Irrationality of Ritualism." I trust that if I find it impossible to avoid occasional expressions of a forcible and plain speaking kind, neither you nor your readers will suppose that I am therefore uncharitable or unfeeling, or that such words as I may use proceed from anything but the force of conviction, or have anything to do with personal unkindness to those whose teaching or practice I may impugn,

First, then, as regards the "Eastward Position," so-called. If this position is not intended by our leading Ritualists to indicate reverence to the elements, would it not be well for them to join in a public protest that this is a mistake? If it has nothing whatever to do with a propitiatory offering or "sacrifice" of the bread and wine, if it is a *mere* "turning to the East" as an old custom—in spite of the fact that in churches built north and south, etc., the turning is continued and is *not* to the east at all, but to a so-called "Altar" and *what is on it*—why is this not publicly affirmed; why on the contrary is so much importance attached to the introduction of this mysterious position, if it means nothing but the remnant of an old custom which in itself would have nothing more peculiar or interesting to High Churchmen than to Evangelicals? But I think it will not be denied by truth-speaking men that this custom, with others, is constantly being introduced with the assertion that it *means nothing* but Eastward worship, where it is deliberately *intended* to make it serve the purpose of that adoration of the elements whose presence on the Table once caused, in my hearing, a leading Ritualist (distinguished, it so happens, for his successful indictment, some years ago, of Cardinal Manning) to observe, "That, brethren, is the *Altar* of the *Throne* of the *Presence of God*"; words which I have never forgotten these twelve years past, and for which I ventured to take the learned gentleman very seriously to task the next day, when he had to admit our powerlessness to *localise* the Presence of God. But were it true that no adoration, no sacrificial *offering* of the elements is implied by facing eastwards, or taught by those who do it, then all this opposition by the Church Association, and by learned and saintly men elsewhere, would be meaningless and inexplicable. Are we to suppose our Ritualist friends have suffered these years of strife and opposition for the sake of a thing in which they *did not themselves believe*, and when by a simple disclaimer they could have prevented it? Why, sir, in one of your own recent Articles you point to the word "Do," in the sacred words of Institution, as *implying* "sacrifice"! But I must say the argument thus used is the most irrational and illogical I ever met with. Out of some thousands of uses of this notoriously common verb, some few—perhaps seven—instances occur of its use in connection with sacrifice. From this it is concluded as a moral certainty, that "Do this," etc., *must* mean "Sacrifice this"! Why, as I have often said, you might *as logically* infer from the occasional use of this common word in the expression "to do for a man" (meaning to kill him) that *every time* this word was used it conveyed the notion of murder! Why, under any circumstances, there can be any use or object in "*offering*" the bread and wine to God, when the command is *not* to "offer" but to "*take*," I cannot conceive.

But what I so specially dislike and protest against

in Ritualistic teaching is their practical evasion of, or opposition to, God's two first Commandments. The use of images *in worship* is now being openly upheld with every specious and ingenious kind of excuse. I confess it is of a piece with that really superstitious and improper reverence for the consecrated bread and wine, to which I have referred, as though they were as to their *substance* and *nature* something more than mere symbols of sacred things. The advocacy of all kinds of art as an accessory of worship is, of course, connected with this introduction of images. And here let me say that, while I yield to none in claiming for our churches cleanliness, decency, and order, while I feel those of a larger and more permament type should have ample solidity and dignity of construction, I consider that the introduction of elaborate carving, elaborate music, pictorial windows, etc., not only unnecessary but inappropriate and distracting in a place of worship, besides approaching dangerously near to infraction of the Second Commandment. It is perfectly easy to maintain the highest possible standard of reverence and impressiveness, without any of the above, by the undoubted effect of a majestic simplicity of outline and construction. The hackneyed argument against what is sometimes called "Evangelical slovenliness" is really unworthy of men of sense, and has *no* application to doctrinal opinions, though it may have to chimney-sweeps, be they *high* or *low*; and if a chimney-sweep is to be ruled an "infidel" because his face is dirty, or if Divine blessing is ruled impossible in places that are ugly, or less cleanly than they might be, then all I say is *experience contradicts it*, and I know High churches that are neither clean nor beautiful. But to conclude, sir, with many thanks for your valuable space, I would say that I entirely support and sympathise with the Church Association in their recent and continued action. While things are pushed to such an extreme in the "Protestant Church of England by law Established," as Cardiff not long ago bore witness; while we have prostrations before, and *bowings to*, an "Altar" of which the Gospels and New Testament statements of redemption teach us nothing; while salvation by the Eucharist is taught, contrary to God's Word; while men erect crosses as *centres* to direct their worship towards—crosses which may easily become, and themselves prepare, for crucifixes after; while idolatrous reverence is offered to a *piece of bread*, and *images* are placed *in front of worshippers;* while men's minds are absorbed in the varied colours of their stoles and robes, and their hearts are set on "musical celebrations" and "functions" which transform our churches into theatres; while these and extravagantly costly buildings are the *objects* of their devotion and their love, and the most exalted *uses* for their wealth and for their labour, while, on the other hand, men's souls may perish for want of some thousand humble mission-halls at home, some thousand earnest missionaries abroad, and the bare means to provide them bread and Bibles,—*so* long will the Church Association and similar bodies have a noble work to do—the work of upholding the State-authorised, Scriptural teaching of our Church against dishonourable imitators of Romanism within her ranks, and so long will I prefer to toil and suffer, if need be in the cause of truth rather than to admit or approve, be his life however "*religious*" and "devout," the unscriptural and un-English, contra-Church-of England teaching of a prelate like the Bishop of Lincoln.

CLERICUS.

London, December 4th, 1890.

IN consequence of the success which attended the opening of the North London Colosseum last winter by the Bishop of Bedford and the Rev. R. S. Hassard, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Dalston, the building has again been secured for that purpose on Sunday evenings. The service commences at half-past eight, and consists of a shortened evensong and sermon by men of various schools of thought in the Church.

WE are enabled to state that the exact form of the minutes of the decree defining the Archbishop's judgment in the case of "Read and others *v.* The Lord Bishop of Lincoln" has not been finally agreed upon between all parties, although a meeting was held for that purpose at the Vicar-General's office of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Doctors-commons, on the 2nd inst. It rests solely with Sir J. Parker Deane, Q.C. (the Vicar-General of his Grace), to issue the decree.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bickerstaff, Rev. Charles Isaac, Vicar of Dronfield; Surrogate for the Diocese of Southwell.

Brewin, Rev. C., B.A., Chaplain at Lausanne.

Creighton, Rev. Mandell, M.A., D.C.L., Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge, and Canon of Worcester; Canon of Windsor.

Crokat, Rev. William Allan, Missioner of the Society of St. Andrew, in the Diocese of Salisbury.

Daniell-Bainbridge, Rev. Howard Gurney, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Westminster; Minor Canon of Westminster.

Dyson, Rev. S. I., D.D., Vice-Principal of the Church Missionary College, Islington.

Everingham, Rev. William, Missioner of the Society of St. Andrew, in the Diocese of Salisbury.

Ford, Rev. Ernest Robert, B.A., Assistant-Curate of St. Matthews', Cambridge; Sub-Warden of the Church Training College for Lay-Workers, at Stepney.

Fulford, Rev. F. J., M.A., Vicar of Flaxley, Gloucestershire.

Hawksley, Rev. W. C., M.A., Vicar-designate of All Saints', Portsea; Chaplain to the Royal Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital.

Highton, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Tarrant Keynston, Dorset.

Holden, Rev. H. B. M. M., Vicar of St. Leonard's, Newark; Surrogate for the Diocese of Southwell.

Jones, Rev. L. T., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Wellingborough; Vicar of St. John's, Peterborough.

Jones, Rev. William, Curate of Usk; Rector of Llansoy, near Usk.

Palmer, Rev. C. J., B.A., Curate of Lewisham; Chaplain on the Bengal (Calcutta) Establishment.

Parish, Rev. J. W., M.A., Curate of Sunderland; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Gateshead.

Paterson, Rev. Walter George, M.A., Rector of West Lydford, Somersetshire.

Payne, Rev. R. E., Senior Curate of Portsea ; Vicar of Hedge End, Botley.
Pearson, Rev. G. F. , M. A., Rural Dean of Boxgrove, Division II.
Pope, Rev. Addrew, M. A., Vicar of Diddlebury, Salop ; Vicar of Upton Bishop, Herefordshire.
Pyemont, Rev. F. S. P., B.A., Chaplain of Perah, on the Straits Settlements.
Rainsford, Rev. W. G., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Boniface, Bunbury, Cheshire.
Randall, Rev. E., M.A., Chaplain at Avranches.
Rees, Rev. G. L. M., Curate of Howden ; Priest-in-Charge of St. Bartholomew's Mission Church, Nottingham.
Rice, Rev. Morgan J., B.A., Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Ajaccio, Corsica.
Ridgeway, Rev. C. J., Vicar of Christ Church. Lancaster-gate ; Honorary Chaplain of the London Diocesan Lay-Readers' Association.
Roe, Rev. A. R. E., Assistant-Priest, St. John's, Harbour Island ; Rector St. Peter's, Abaco, Diocese Nassau.
Sadleir, Rev. F., M.A., First Class Chaplain to the Forces, Senior Chaplain Western Military District, Plymouth ; Senior Chaplain South-Eastern District, Dover.
Simmonds, Rev. D. E. M., Association Secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society for the North-Western District of England.
Solbé, Rev. C. A., B.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class ; Chaplain to the Forces, First Class.
St. Aubyn, Rev. Edmund, B.A., Vicar of Grazeley, Berks.
Shore, Rev. Thomas Teignmouth, M.A., Incumbent of Berkeley Chapel, Mayfair ; Canon of Worcester.
Short, Rev. S. G., M.A., Curate of Paston ; Rector of Northborough, near Market Deeping.
Slocock, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Rector of West Rounton, Yorkshire.
Smith, Rev. Edward Darnley, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Landscove, Devonshire.
Smith, Rev. J. Taylor, Curate of St. Paul's, Penge, Surrey ; Canon of St. George's Cathedral, Sierra Leone, and Diocesan Missioner.
Stewart, Rev. H. W., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Gateshead ; Vicar of Lumley, Fencehouses.
revaldwyn, Rev. B. W. J., Rector of Nether Whitacre, near Birmingham ; Rector of St. Martin-by-Loo, Cornwall.
Ward, Rev. W., Curate of Hadleigh ; Vicar of Hauxton-with-Newton, Cambridge.
Warner, Rev. John, Curate of Brereton ; Vicar of All Saints', Wolverhampton.
West, Rev. Auguste B. S., Chaplain to the *Agamemnon*.
Whistler, Rev. Alfred J., Chaplain to the *Dreadnought*.
Windsor, Rev. Edward John, Perpetual Curate of Horrabridge, Devonshire.
Woollcombe, Rev. George Ley, M.A., Public Preacher in the diocese of Exeter.
Wynter, Rev. R. W., M.A., Vicar of Wellingborough ; Surrogate for the diocese of Peterborough.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bennett, Rev. James Arthur, Rector of South Cadbury, Somerset at Bath, on Dec. 5, aged 55.
Berkeley, Rev. George Campion, for fifty years Vicar of the parish, at Southminster Vicarage, Essex, on Dec. 5, aged 78.
Dandsay, Rev. J. H., at Kelshall Rectory, Royston, on St. Andrew's Day, suddenly.
Laing, Rev. Malcolm, M.A., of Christ's Hospital, at 16, Thurlowhill, West Dulwich, on Dec. 3, aged 61.
Lear, Rev. William, M.A., Priest-in-Charge of St. Anne's, Buxton, Derbyshire, at Rye, on Oct. 22, aged 41.
Mason, Rev. Alfred William, Hon. Canon of St. Alban's Cathedral, and Rural Dean of Dedham, Essex, at St. Mary's, Colchester, on Dec. 3, in his 72nd year.
Pendered, Rev. W. Leeman, M.A., late Incumbent of Ennerdale, Cumberland, and formerly Head Master of Haydonbridge Grammar School, at Grasse (Alpes Maritimes), on Dec. 1, aged 66.
Roper, Rev. Thomas Henry, late Rector of Puddlehinton, at Rodwell, Weymouth, on Dec. 5, aged 71.
Sutcliffe, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar and Rector of the parish since 1841, at Keele Rectory, Newcastle, Staffordshire, on Dec. 3, aged 79.
Taylor, Rev. J. C. Fox, B.A., at 10, Milner-square, on Dec. 1.

INTERESTING TO CRICKETERS.

MR. W. GUNN, the celebrated Nottingham professional, writing from the County Cricket Warehouse, 14, Carrington-street, Nottingham, 9th July, says :—"You will be glad to hear that the Electropathic Belt I had from you has quite cured the rheumatism that prevented me from playing football last winter ; and it has also been of great benefit in sustaining strength of nerve and endurance, which qualities are both of great importance to cricketers. The marvellous curative properties of this genuine Electric Belt are now well known. It gives wonderful support to the spine and internal organs of the body, is light and comfortable to wear, and may be relied upon to speedily invigorate the most debilitated constitution."

Descriptive illustrated pamphlet, book of testimonials, and consultation free, either personally or by letter, on application to the Medical Battery Company, Limited, 52, Oxford-st., London, W. (the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.)

WHAT ARE HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELTS?

"A Boon to Sufferers."

They are genuine curative Electric Belts, constructed upon the principle of the dry pile. They require no moisture other than that of the skin to put them in action, the contact with the body being quite sufficient for medical purposes. They comprise the perfection of the methods adopted by the celebrated Professor A. Humboldt and Dr. Burg, etc., and in every case where doctors usually prescribe a course of hydropathy, one of Harness' Electropathic Belts may be substituted with advantage. Acting, as they do, upon all the most important organs of the body, they rarely fail to alleviate most of the disorders resulting from local or general debility, impaired digestion, weak circulation, or defective organic action.

THESE GENUINE ELECTRIC BELTS

are exceedingly comfortable to wear, give wonderful support and vitality to the internal organs of the body, improve the figure, prevent chills, impart new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulate the organic action, promote the circulation, assist digestion, and promptly renew that vital energy the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Their healing properties are multifarious. They stimulate the functions of various organs, increase their secretions, give tone to muscle and nerves, relax morbid contractions, improve nutrition, and

RENEW EXHAUSTED NERVE FORCE.

Acting directly on the system, they sustain and assist its various functions, and thus promote the health and vigour of the entire frame.

Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELTS

have stood the test of nearly twenty-five years, have restored thousands of sufferers to health and vigour, are guaranteed to be perfectly genuine, and are constructed on sound scientific principles. The Medical Battery Company (Limited) are the Sole Proprietors and Manufacturers of these now world-famed Curative Appliances ; and, should any of our readers still have the least doubt as to their bonâ-fide character, they are invited to call without delay at the Company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street (at the corner of Rathbone-place), London, W., where they can see the Belts scientifically tested, and can personally examine the thousands of unsolicited testimonials and Press reports that have been received from all parts of the world.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE RIGHT USE OF SUNDAY.

By the Rev. W. H. BLISS, M.A., Mus. Bac., Vicar of Kew, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

Sermon Preached in St. James's Chapel Royal, Sunday Morning, October 12th, 1890.

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day."—Rev. i. 10.

NO one who lives in London, or its immediate vicinity, can fail to know something of that marvellous tide of human life which flows into it with so full a volume every morning and ebbs with such rapidity every evening of six days out of seven. Many, also, must have witnessed the astonishing contrast when Sunday comes round, for now all the thronged and busy marts of yesterday and of to-morrow are hushed, and the vacant pavements echo to the feet of the wayfarer, otherwise so deserted and so still that this great metropolis might almost seem to a visitor from some of the Continental centres of life and population like some city of the dead, of which the warehouses would be the cenotaphs, the shops and offices the tombstones of a once great but departed commerce. And not only here in London, but in all parts of the British Empire, and, in some degree, in every parish and district in Christendom, something of the same marked contrast is seen. Now, why should there be this astonishing difference between one day and another? What is its cause? What its justification? Ought you and I to do what we can to maintain it, as a wholesome and desirable state of things, or ought we to throw what influence we possess into the opposite scale, and try to banish what is regarded by some as an observance inconvenient, superstitious, and obsolete? Brethren, we all find it an immense help in our practical life simply to call things by their right names, and when we call the first day of the week "the Lord's Day," after the example of the beloved Apostle in the text, we have already done much to clear the ground for the right understanding of the great Christian institution of which I desire to say a few words to you this morning.

We all know that most of our great Christian institutions strike their roots deep into a past which was already remote at the dawn of the Christian era. We all know that Christianity is, in some sense, a development, an expansion, an evolutionary child of Judaism. Our great festivals are the old Jewish festivals, baptised, as it were. Thus the Passover becomes Easter. Pentecost passes upwards into Whitsuntide. Our Scriptures are built, as it were, on the foundation of their Scriptures; and so "the Lord's Day" is not, so to speak, an invention of Christianity, but an adaptation of the primeval institution—the Sabbath. The principle had been ages ago laid down of devoting one day in seven to God's more especial worship and service. The duty had been strictly enjoined (according to Lightfoot and other high authorities) ages before the time of Moses, or even of Abraham; and we find the observance of the Sabbath insisted upon not as a merely ceremonial act, whose observance might pass away, but as part and parcel of the moral law as set forth in the Decalogue, as, indeed, an essential part of the highest portion of that law—viz., man's duty towards his God. Every part of that law it may be observed was old, not new, even when God with His own finger wrote it on the table of stone. Abraham and Isaac and Jacob—not to say Enoch and Noah and Adam himself—knew well all these commandments. To them no less than to us it was well known that God must be worshipped, revered, and obeyed; to them no less than to us murder and adultery, theft and lying, were altogether abhorrent; yet it is well worthy of observation that one only of these old laws was republished with the significant preamble "Remember," and *that* the commandment which enjoins upon man to consecrate a defined portion of his time to the honour and glory of his Creator. "Remember," showing that the statute was no new one, but had been handed down to the Mosaic from the Patriarchal Church. "Remember," foreseeing and foretelling that even those who were not negligent as to the rest of the Decalogue might require a special caution as to this, as seeming to them, perhaps, to form no portion of the Moral, but to have rather a savour of the Ceremonial Law.

Now, there is no doubt it is, in some respects, an advantage to us to be able to regard "the Lord's Day" as "the Christian Sabbath." But there is also danger in this view, except we are careful to emphasise the adjective "Christian." To call "the Lord's Day" simply "the Sabbath," especially in a church where the Fourth Commandment is read Sunday after Sunday as a part of the moral law, is fraught with danger—one of the worst of dangers, the danger arising from unreality. Consider! In the Fourth Commandment a day of absolute rest is prescribed; no kind of work is to be done by master or mistress, son or daughter, manservant or maidservant, by horse or cattle. It is not mere unnecessary or non-urgent work that is prescribed or forbidden, but all work. Now we none of us keep this commandment. The more sincere and zealous among the Jews do. They will not cook their food, or make a bed, or light a candle even on the Sabbath Day, but engage some Gentile to do these necessary things for them. Why, then, this wide difference between their observance and ours? Because, brethren, the day we keep is not

the Jewish Sabbath at all. Neither the day itself, nor the way in which we keep it is the same. We neither observe the seventh day, nor is the day we keep the Jewish Sabbath, but another day of the week. Our Christian day of rest—which we may call our "Sabbath," as we may call "the Lord's Supper" our Passover, or Whitsuntide our "Pentecost," if only we remember the limitations with which we use the expression—is held on the first, not the seventh, day of the week, and its mode of observance has, from the earliest days of Christianity, been in many respects different from the Jewish Sabbath. This latter was instituted chiefly to commemorate God's cessation from His creative as distinguished from His superintending and sustaining work, which is unceasing; while our weekly festival was instituted to keep in perpetual memory the great central fact of the Christian religion—viz., that Jesus Christ rose on that day triumphant over death and the grave, thereby proving Himself to be the Son of God with power, and settling for ever His claims upon our adoring love. Rest, then, is not the chief object set before us in keeping the Lord's Day. Rather a thankful, a joyful remembrance of all which the resurrection of Christ implies, and all which our professed belief in that resurrection pledges us to. That resurrection implies His eternal power and Godhead, while it pledges us to His worship and service every day, but in a peculiar degree and in a special manner on the first day of the week, when we especially commemorate His most glorious victory, so pregnant in all great spiritual results to the Church and the world, over all the powers of darkness.

It is, indeed, one of the wonders of the spiritual world that this transfer from the seventh day—so solemnly set apart by God Himself, and the observance of which was consecrated by the example of so many centuries of the greatest prophets, wisest legislators, and mightiest kings of Israel—should ever have taken place. That this day, thus divinely ordained, thus solemnly consecrated, should have been abandoned, and another day instituted in its place—is not this one undeniable fact among the most powerful corroborations of the whole Christian story? For think what kind of event must that be which would lead Christendom now to abandon its observance of the first day, for the second, third, or some other day of the week. Would it not require an event no less stupendous than the resurrection of Christ from the dead to lead us and all Christendom to cease to observe the Sunday as our day of worship, rest, and joyful remembrance, and to substitute for it Monday or Tuesday or some other day? Yet even this were by no means a parallel case; for none of us profess to find in our sacred writings a plain and explicit command to keep the first day of the week in some especial manner, while, on the other hand, none can deny either the command or its plainness, explicitness and emphasis in the case of the seventh day as binding upon the Jews. Yet we find in the New Testament the observance of the Sabbath is never spoken of as any part of Christian life or duty. Our Lord Himself, again and again, chose the Sabbath for the performance of His mighty works, thereby demonstrating that the current views of Sabbath observance were not true or beneficial, and hinting that the observance itself, as the Jews of the time knew it, was one of those shadows of good things to come that must pass away. In the very earliest days of the Christian Church we find "the first day of the week" was already *the* day of public worship, and especially of "the breaking of the bread," that special Christian ordinance out of which all the various ramifications of Christian worship have since been evolved, and without which no primitive Christian would have felt "the Lord's Day" had been properly observed. And what we find in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles we find also in the earliest Christian writings outside the canon of Holy Scripture, that the first day of the week is universally recognised as "the Lord's Day," a day of joyful reunion for all Christians for the united worship of Him Who was dead and is alive again, and Who liveth in glory for evermore.

Let us sum up, then, brethren, what has been established so far. We have in the Fourth Commandment the plainest possible Scriptural authority for the consecration of one day in seven to the more especial worship and service of Almighty God, while by the Church (as the keeper and interpreter of Holy Writ) we are taught which day out of the seven we are to observe thus specially, and what should be our method of observing it. Let not the latter fact lower or lessen our sense of the obligation, the duty, and the privilege of observing "the Lord's Day"; but if it should tend to raise and increase our appreciation of the authority of the Church in such matters this will be no cause for regret. Two of the greatest blessings a Christian people can thank God for we owe (under Him) to His Church —viz., the knowledge of what books do and what do not constitute the Bible, and the observance of the Lord's Day.

Let us inquire, then, in conclusion, brethren, what should be our chief objects in keeping the Lord's Day, and how may these objects best be attained? The first and highest by far of our objects in observing "the Lord's Day" is that we may have time and opportunity for the public worship of Almighty God. It is only when men practically ignore this great duty, disregard this unspeakable blessing, forget this serious responsibility, that they can have any doubt about the desirableness of observing "the Lord's Day," one day in seven to give more especially to Him Who giveth us "life and breath and all things"—if any fault were to be found with this arrangement must it not be this—that it would prove far too little for so great a purpose?

Were it practicable, no doubt all pious souls would eagerly desire that the six days should be given to God and one only to the affairs of time and of this world. And let us thankfully acknowledge how many there are who, in their everyday life, their profession, their business, their daily work of whatever kind, live

As ever in their great Taskmaster's eye ;

and by their honourable dealings, their unselfishness, their endeavour to guide all their thoughts, words, and acts by the Spirit of God's Word and the holy example there set forth, consecrate not one day in seven, but all the seven to Him and His honour, thus making the office, the workshop, the home, a true place of God's service.

Yet does the sad truth remain that many a so-called Christian is asking himself, "How little of the Sunday can I give up to public worship and to thoughts of God and eternity without committing actual sin—without bringing my soul into danger or my character into disrepute? May I play lawn tennis; may I spend the day, or great part of it, on the river; may I give my mind to my business or professional pursuits? May I set out for the Continent or return from it on the Sunday? May I read novels, magazines, newspapers? How nearly may I treat Sunday like any other day without altogether giving up my character, abandoning my position, and forfeiting my hopes as a Christian"? The disregard—the growing disregard, of the Lord's Day—sad as it is in itself, is, like many other sad things, still more deplorable, inasmuch as it is a symptom of deep-seated deadly disease. Even drunkenness, horrible as it is in itself, is far worse as telling a tale of utter want of self-control, of watchfulness against evil habits, of Christian principle in general self-management. And neglect and depreciation of public worship, depend upon it, tells also a tale of private prayer neglected, Bible unread, God not in all—indeed, too often God not in any—of the thoughts of men's hearts, except when He smites them with some sore affliction in their health, their fortune, or their homes.

Strange, is it not, that every man or woman who professes to be a servant and soldier of Christ should feel one act of public recognition of the Almighty is enough—more than enough—for a whole week? Ought not every such person to entertain serious fears, whether, if the mere force of habit were withdrawn, he would, like many others, never cross a sacred threshold again? Let us fix our attention upon this one fact, and meditate upon it at our leisure. To avail us at all, our worship in God's house must be inspired by and mingled with love to Him, to whom we owe everything in Nature, in providence, in grace. Now is it, let me ask, the wont of love to give the least possible, or to study how to minimise the time, thought, labour spent in the presence and in the service of one whom we really have in our hearts? We all know well the contrary.

Rightly understood, the public worship on "the Lord's Day" in His house ought to be the great joy of the week, looked forward to from Monday morning till Saturday night, as it well may be when the services are so bright and reverent and beautiful as those which it is our privilege to join in here And especially should this be the case with the great service of thanksgiving, the Holy Eucharist, the foretaste of heaven upon earth, where, more than in any other act, we jion "with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven" in lauding, magnifying, and blessing God's most holy Name. For what higher, what holier, what happier occupation can we look forward to even in heaven itself?

But, beside public worship, there are other objects which we should set before us in the observance of the Lord's Day, other blessings which accrue to us if we make a faithful and dutiful use of it. And chief among these is rest—not its parody, sloth. The rest which comes from relaxation and recreation, not of indolence and dissipation. Rest by change of occupation more especially—rest of mind, by getting away from week-day thoughts and cares; rest of body; rest, above all, of heart and soul by communion with Him, Who knoweth whereof we are made, and Who so tenderly invites us, "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest." Now, do we not all know that one of the most really resting and refreshing things in life is change. Let us, then, who would claim the full benefit of the loving provision made for our needs by the weekly day of rest make it as unlike as we can to our week days. The newspaper, the novel, the sights and sounds, the thoughts and ideas of our every-day life—all of them well enough in their time and place—should, as far as possible, be laid aside on "the Lord's Day," not only out of reverence for the day, but in order that we may have the benefit (and it is no small one) of a thorough change of ideas. We all know what change of air and scene is to the health of the body; and, depend upon it, it is a great advantage to us mentally, morally, physically, as well as spiritually, to get out of the groove in which most of our lives must needs be spent, and once in the week to breathe a fresh air, to have a new stream of thoughts, ideas, and feelings course through the veins of the soul.

For the same reason, and for others, let our ordinary amusements and bodily recreations be laid aside. Cricket and boating, lawn tennis, and other relaxations are all excellent at proper times, but whatever we may think of a game at cricket on a village green on a Sunday afternoon for those—if such there be—who have no relaxation in the week-day, we shall hesitate long before we advocate or ourselves adopt any plan, which, harmless as it may seem, in some particular case may turn out a very Frankenstein in our hands. We may find it easier to create than to control, easier to set it on

its downward path than to arrest it in mid course.

The question of opening our great national collections, picture galleries, libraries, museums on "the Lord's Day" stands on quite a different footing. They are the property of the nation, and the nation has its property rights as well as individuals, nor can I see anything inconsistent in attending God's house morning and evening, and spending an hour among beautiful works of art in the afternoon. If the masses of our fellow-countrymen desire it, and proper precautions were taken against the work of the officials becoming compulsory, my own opinion is that the boon ought to be gladly conceded. Is it not terrible that at present the only place of relaxation open to the vast masses of the population on "the Lord's Day" is the public-house! Can we believe that this is according to the mind of Him who came that men "might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly"?

Another reason why we should all of us greatly value the observance of "the Lord's Day" is, that it gives us special opportunities for the study of sacred subjects. What a vast field is this! How important, how interesting, yet may I also add, and *how generally neglected*, is the Bible itself. Who can exhaust its interest—reinforced as this interest is again and again, by modern theories, which may seem sometimes to threaten to shake its authority, and by modern discoveries, which, in so many instances, have proved so strongly corroborative of it?

The History of the Church from the call of Abraham to the present day—a period of nearly 4,000 years—summarised in such works as Dean Milman's "History of the Jews," "History of Christianity," "History of Latin Christianity," The History of the Papacy; of the Reformation, on the Continent and in our own country; The History of the Missions to the Heathen, of which our own century has seen such a wonderful revival and expansion, and in which our own branch of Christ's Church, especially of late years, has been permitted to take so prominent a part. Some of the great doctrinal works written by the learned, wise, and holy men of the earlier centuries, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil; or by learned, wise, and holy Englishmen, a Hooker, a Jeremy Taylor, a Pearson among our spiritual ancestry, a Wordsworth, a Kingsley, a Lightfoot, Westcott, or Farrar among the Churchmen of our own days, and for those to whom these might seem too heavy, too profound, or too elaborate, what treasures there are of religious biography, records of how men and women of "like passions" and infirmities with ourselves "out of weakness were made strong," and by the diligent use of the same means which we enjoy, have risen to heights of holiness, have spent and been spent in the service of God and man, have proved themselves to be, in fact what we are all in name, the true children of that God whose nature is holiness and wisdom, power and love. Who can read the life of St. Augustine, of St. Anselm, of Francis of Assisi, of St. Louis, of Luther, of Wesley, of Livingstone, of Lord Shaftesbury, General Gordon, of several of our recently deceased bishops, clergy, and holy laymen without feeling a renewed desire to walk in their footsteps or to emulate their inspiring examples?

Now, brethren, is it not the simple truth that nine out of ten of any ordinary congregation know less of their Bibles, of the history of God's Church, of the great standard works of the Fathers, of our own divines, and even of religious biography, than of almost any other subject which professes to be of minor—even of general—human interest? Many who have spent some of the best years of their life in the study of the history of ancient Greece and Rome, and of modern Europe—what writer have they read, what time have they devoted, what interest have they shown in the subjects to which I have been now referring? Yet what an opportunity is presented to us for all this by the Lord's Day. Surely this is a momentous, a practical question: let me urge you to give to its consideration that attention of which it is so well worthy.

Parents, show a safe, a wise, a true example to your children in this matter. Young people, be very careful how you begin to walk the downward course of neglect and carelessness with respect to the observance of "the Lord's Day"; a neglect and carelessness leading onwards, with only too much probability, to total abandonment of the pious lessons of your childhood and your youth. The three great teachers of man, as regards his wisdom in time, and his happiness in eternity, are the Bible, the Church, and experience. Let us then remember: In the Bible God claims a seventh part of man's time as especially His own. In harmony with which many a place in the ancient Scriptures is occupied with the record of His blessing upon the observance of the Sabbath, and of punishment for its neglect. The Church, by the authority committed to her by Christ—and a very wonderful proof it is of that authority—teaches us that neither the day nor the method of its observance is identical with that enjoined upon the Jews. She teaches us to prize the Lord's Day above all, as giving time and opportunity for united public worship and restful change and occupation, for reading and meditation on whatever may help us in our Christian life, and for such works of practical benevolence as our bread-winning duties will not permit us to engage in on the other six day's and, lastly, experience tells us that the observance of the Lord's Day and its application to meet purposes such as these brings a blessing with it. Two hundred years ago a celebrated English judge put on record his conviction, derived from his own experience—

> A Sunday well spent
> Brings a week of content;

and the most conspicuous Englishman now living has testified within the last few months to his belief that he owes much of his extraordinary mental and physical energy, at upwards of four-score years of age, to the fact that he has always laid aside his week-day work and, as much as possible, his week-day thoughts on the Lord's Day.

In a life of seventy years remember there are no less than ten whole years of Sundays. Ten years —a period which sees a boy enter a public school, go through all the stages of schoolboy life till he wins his scholarship at the university, his college prizes, his fellowship, and is already on the roll of one or other of the learned professions, a member of Parliament, perhaps, and oftentimes a husband and a father. Now, of these ten years of Sundays, if you and I live to life's ordinary limit, you and I must give a strict and solemn account. Oh! rather let me say: "What an opportunity of spiritual self-cultivation is offered to us by these ten years! what an education we may give ourselves if we only will, in things spiritual, by turning these years to good account! what acquaintance with God and with our own hearts may we make! what knowledge of God's dealings with His Church before and after Christ may we acquire! what treasures may we be laying up for memory to dwell upon in our old age!" and (if so be) on a bed of prolonged sickness, if only we can each one say of each of our Sundays what St. John tells us of his: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day!"

THE ONE FOUNDATION.

By the Rev. H. S. VERSCHOYLE, M.A.

Sermon Preached at San Remo.

"Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus."—1 Cor. iii. 2.

["The Scriptures] are they which testify of Me."—St. John v. 39.

"From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

"The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."—1 Tim. iii. 15.

PERHAPS at no time has the question, "What is truth?" been so frequently asked as it is now. Asked it is, sometimes scoffingly, sometimes earnestly, sometimes hopefully, sometimes despairingly. And different as are the tones in which it is asked, so different are the answers given to it.

One answer which is frequently given and extensively accepted, is that truth is what can be ascertained by the understanding acting on the data of the senses. To this some would add what can be attained by the use of the conscience, independently of any special revelation.

The first answer is that which is given explicitly by many scientists, and which, as I endeavoured some time ago to show in another sermon, is given implicitly by not a few believers in Christianity, while the latter is given by not a few theists.

The former seem to overlook the fact that in the establishment and development of natural sciences (which they regard as the only true science or knowledge) there are categories presupposed which are supersensuous, and for the establishment of the validity of which the use of a higher faculty than understanding is needed.

I think it may be profitable for us to consider the answer which is given in the first verse of my text, and to consider the relation to it of the truths expressed in the two latter verses. Bishop Butler, as we all know, spoke of probability as being "the guide of life," and showed in his great work how great is the probability of the truth of each of the leading doctrines of Christianity. But in a matter of such awful importance as the relation of the soul to its God, I do not think we can rest in mere probability; however high, that nothing can satisfy except absolute certainty.

Now if we look outside the sphere of morality and religion, we find one class of truths, which are apprehended with absolute certainty—the truths of mathematics. These truths are absolutely necessary, and they are so because they are truths of time and space which are forms of thought in its widest sense. Thus they have their necessity, their absolute certainty in being truths of what is part of the substance of our being as thinkers, of our spiritual being.

And we find the same in morality and religion. We can apprehend the truths of morality with absolute certainty; we cannot conceive their contradictories, because they are truths of the conscience, which is part of the substance of our being.

And so it is with the fundamental truths of religion; we can apprehend them with absolute certainty, because they are truths of Him Who is the very ultimate substance of our being, "in Whom we live and move and are," "in Whom all things are created and consist," Who "is the true Light which lighteth every man."

In earthly affairs however important we often have to act on a belief which is *grounded* on the authority of others, an external authority; and some have endeavoured to conclude from this that in matters of religion we must be content with a belief similarly grounded. But in the first verse in the text, St. Paul points us to a ground of belief which is not outward but inward, which is of the substance of our spiritual being, and which can thus give us absolute certainty: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" The word which St. Paul uses expresses not merely that no different, or inconsistent,

foundation, but that *no additional* foundation can be laid.

He uses two words for "other" in Galatians i. 6, 7—"I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto *another* gospel: which is not *another*." It is the latter of the two words that he uses here. Thus he emphasises the absoluteness, uniqueness of the foundation, the truth that our religious belief should rest only on Christ Jesus not on anything else beside Him.

This truth has not always, I think, been very clearly put forward in the Christian Church. Some have put forward the authority of the Church as the foundation of our faith; others, like Chillingworth in his famous saying, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants," have put forward the Bible as that foundation. Most important is the authority of the Bible, and most important is the authority of the Church in relation to our faith; but to put either forward as the foundation of it is to seek to lay a foundation additional to the foundation—Christ Jesus; it is to make the Bible or the Church the ground of our faith, for if we only believe in Christ on the authority of the Bible or the Church, the one or the other, and not Christ, is the ground of our faith, and we fall into an error like that which our Lord pointed out to the Jews when He said, "Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye *think* ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me, and ye will not come to Me that ye might have life." But not only is this the case, but further, we render impossible the attainment of that absolute certainty in religion which the awful importance of the subject makes us demand. For if our acceptance of the truth of Christianity rests either on the authority of the Bible or that of the Church, the most we can attain to is very high or the very highest probability which, by the fact of its being probability, implies a propability, however small, of the truth of its contradictory. Further, to take, for the sake of brevity, one of these authorities—that of the Bible—and to suppose that it is sought to establish solely on its authority the truth of some teaching as to the character of God. In order to reach the conclusion, even as a probability, we must pass by a number of steps. First there must be decided the question of the trustworthiness of the original writing, as reporting an original revelation, then that of the genuineness of the manuscripts by comparison of which the reading we use has been settled, then that of the legitimacy of the induction by which the reading has been arrived at in the case of each passage we are using, then that of the correctness of the translation of each passage, then that of the correctness of our translation of each passage, then that of the legitimacy of the induction by which we have drawn the conclusion from these passages.

Here are six steps, and their number might easily be extended. Now, supposing that each of these steps has been correctly taken, that is, that there is a high probability that the conclusion in each is true, say a probability of ten to one, does this show the probability, that the teaching it is sought to establish by them as true, to be also as 10 to 1? Not in the least. The probability of the truth of the ultimate conclusion depends on the probabilities of the truth of each of the previous conclusions, and is, in mathematical language, represented by the product of all these probabilities. Thus, instead of being $\frac{10}{11}$, which is the fraction which represents the probability of the truth of each of the above-mentioned conclusions, it is the 6th power of $\frac{10}{11}$, *i.e.*, $\frac{10}{11}$ multiplied by itself 5 times, which is $\frac{1000000}{1783661}$, but little more than half; so that the probability of the teaching in question being true is but slightly greater than that of its contradictory being true. And a similar course of reasoning applies to the endeavour to establish the truth of any teaching by the authority of the Church. But, even supposing the probability of each of the steps being correctly taken, and so that of the truth of the conclusion to be much higher, how many are there who are qualified to take these steps? Compared to the whole number of Christians, are they not an extremely small number? And what are the illiterate and uneducated to do? And what are we, the more or less educated, to do? Most of us have not the learning to qualify us for deciding all these questions—the preacher of this sermon certainly has not. We need something simpler, something more direct; and this we find in the foundation St. Paul speaks of—Christ Jesus. We can compare every teaching about the character of God directly with His character, and be assured of its truth or falsehood by its conformity to, or disagreement with, this.

But it may be asked, "How do we receive the accounts of our Lord's character except on the authority of the Bible or of the Church?" Here enters the question of the place of the authority of the Bible and of that of the Church. The authority of each is great and reverend, and bespeaks our most earnest and reverent attention; but it is not on the authority of either or both that we *ground* our faith in God. They are the great *means* of bringing us to that faith, but they are not its *ground*. "The Church is the pillar and stay of the truth." She holds up the Truth, that we may see it and believe. The whole of the Scriptures, like the Old Testament, of which our Lord spoke, "testify of" Christ; they are able thus to make us "wise unto salvation," are "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for discipline in righteousness"; they set Christ before us, that so the light of His self-evidence shining into our spirits may waken in us the absolute certainty,

"the full assurance of faith." To repeat what I think I have said in another sermon, we accept the character of Jesus and the truth of the Incarnation *by means* of the Bible and the Church, *not on their authority.* Taking the four Gospels as we find them, and entering into no question as to their authenticity, genuineness, or inspiration, we find there a perfect Life—a Life which surpasses and raises up, and still surpasses our highest moral Ideal, which thus proves its Divinity and its reality. And such a Life to have been described must have been lived, and, being lived, it was the very life of God on earth.

The revelation which we find there wakens in us a knowledge of God which we should not have had without it, but which, when we have by this means apprehended, we perceive to be necessarily true, and hold independently of all authority other than itself. As Newman so truly said ("Arguments and Discussions"): "The contemplation of our Lord's character, as carrying with it its own evidence is the point to which after all, and in fact, all religious minds turn, and in which they ultimately rest."

God grant that each one of us may "consider Him" Who is the one "Foundation," that we may consider Him to our souls' health, that looking upon Him as the Foundation of our faith in our Father, we may thus find Him to be the Foundation of our salvation from sin, the Foundation of our strength for advancing victory over sin, the Foundation of our hope of completed victory and perfect salvation from sin in the brightness of His fully revealed Presence in the freedom and restful activity of our Father's Home.

THE *Western Morning News* says that Canon F. E. Carter, acting under medical advice, is about to leave Cornwall for three months rest.

THE Rev. Dr. Dyson has been appointed vice-principal of the Church Missionary College, Islington. Dr. Dyson has for many years, says the *Record*, done good and useful work as senior tutor at that institution.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXIX. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1890.

FANATICAL CRITICISM.

THERE always has been a varying quantity of men and women who, whilst imbued with a certain amount of Christian purpose and intention, are yet so blind to the true nature of our Lord's teachings, that they are ever living under the impression that all who do not believe and practice word for word or action for action, just what they do themselves, are deniers of the faith and as "evil men," deserve to have all sorts of "sweet" epithets launched against them. So far do they frequently go, that they distort the plain expression of Scripture, and are injured because honest and sincere men cannot see their way to adopt the same phase of narrowmindedness as they do.

These men are, of course, to be found in both extremes of our Church as well as out of it, but it cannot be denied that they are best represented by a class of *so-called* Churchmen for whom the "Church Association" is a rallying point. A class of men who at once impress you with the idea that they are the victims of a highly enlarged and morbid liver, and are hence at war both with themselves and with everybody and everything. As a rule, they imitate admirably the proverbial dog in the manger; they do little or nothing themselves, and seek to spend their time and energies in doing what they can to prevent their more sincere brethren from doing their part.

There are many such, though we rejoice to know that their generation is passing away, and their voice will soon be hushed in silence, inasmuch as it is always the voice of bitter, unreasoning emnity rather than the cool, well-balanced, and withal charitable opinion of a true follower of Him who said "Love one another."

. They persistently assert, and no doubt delude themselves into the belief, that every faithful and energetic clergyman is either a Jesuit in disguise or at least a Romanist at heart, and perhaps an emissary of the Pope's; whilst every beautiful and pious practice which the Church adopts or resumes is at once stigmatized by them as "another innovation," "a new Romish trick," etc.

As long as these men are *laymen* we can only regret that they have as yet learned so little of the joy which comes from a truly humble spirit, and that moreover they should so poorly carry out the teaching of that Church to which, whilst often attending dissenting places of worship, they nominally belong. But when these men are within the pale of our own priesthood and represent our own Church and her teachings in an authoritative manner the matter is much more serious. That they do exist is we believe a matter beyond doubt, and they are easily recognised: there is an utter want of manliness and openness about them; if they begin to argue, they lay down such an array of conditions and axioms as utterly to remove the true spirit of discussion. They invariably start on the assumption that *they cannot be wrong*, and though they do not always say so, they almost invariably imply that the nine-tenths of our English clergy who are doing their duty, as well as the whole bench of bishops (except the bishop of Liverpool) may expect to have the furnace heated for them seven times more than it is wont to be in a certain unmentionable place. These men no doubt are sincere as far as their light goes, but surely "their light" would be better expressed by "their darkness," for whence do they obtain it. They cannot obtain it from the Bible, for their bitterness and uncharitableness would hardly accord with the Biblical themes of forbearing Love; no, it is from *The Christian* or other undenominational (practically dissenting) papers that this ardent lover of his Church obtains all his diseased theology. Would it not be better, (to turn his own words against himself,) for him to come out and be honest and acknowledge that *both in heart and practice he is a Dissenter.* Wherein then lies his right to throw stones whilst he is living in a glass-house? We fail to see much difference between the Jesuit in disguise and the Dissenter in disguise. Both are equally repulsive; as to the one so to the other we would say *You are traitors to your Church, your religion, and yourself.*

When, as in the recent decision of the Archbishop, they find that bigotry and mean underhandedness are not to gain the day, they groan over the £10,000 which they have to pay as costs, and declare that "disestablishment would be better than this," and in so doing, take up the popular Nonconformist Battle Cry under the impression that they may by these means injure that sacred Church *to which they have pledged unqualified devotion.* This is but a common event amongst them and shows only too clearly "whose they are and whom they serve." But Right must in the long run be victorious, and should that disestablishment, which they so dearly hope will break the back of English Church feeling, really become a fact, they will be the first to find themselves summarily ejected *as renegade cowards* from the position which now allows them to bark, even with their puny whine, at the stalwart body of our English clergy.

THE PERSONALITY OF SATAN.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Rector of Warrenpoint.*

The Satan of popular conception and popular legend is a being with whose characteristics we are all more or less familiar. In our young days we had awful, but somewhat hazy, notions of a supernatural personage, with horns, tail, cloven-hoof and straight leg, surrounded with an atmosphere of brimstone, and endowed with powers of far-reaching extent. For him and his demon-followers, popular theology created that hell whose fires burn for ever, and whose torments are to extend, without mitigation or cessation, through the ages of an endless eternity. Is there any such being as Satan? Is the personality of the devil a monkish dream? And is evil, after all, nothing more than the absence of good?

We shall glance at this question from four points of view:—

(1) The popular conception of Satan. (2) The scientific view. (3) The poetic. (4) The Scriptural.

I.

The popular view of Satan represents him as a kind of god, endowed with omniscience, with omnipresence, and with powers almost as great as those exercised by God. The anecdote will occur to you, in illustration of what I say, of the old woman crossing the swollen river on a dark night, who, seeing the angry waters ready to sweep her away, began to mumble her prayers—"Lord, have mercy upon us!" then, reflecting that conciliation was wiser than provocation, added, "As for the devil, perhaps, he's not as black as he's painted."

This same anxiety to keep well in with both parties may be traced in the old superstitions which linger even yet in parts of Ireland, where the mischievous elves, that steal children and blast cattle and crops, and bring all sorts of ill-luck to houses, are spoken of as "the good people."

The lines of Burns are well known:—

> But fare ye weel auld Nickie ben,
> O, wad ye tak a thought and men',
> Ye aiblins might, I dinna ken—
> Still hae a stake;
> I'm wae to think upon yon den,
> E'en for your sake.

Of course we may trace these popular ideas to the old monkish legends of the Middle Ages, when men were supposed to enter into a personal contract with the devil, who consented, on his part, to work their will and obey their behests for a certain period, after

* For an Article on this subject by the same writer, see "Dublin University Magazine," Vol. 88, p. 707.

which he came to claim the soul which was forfeit, according to bargain, and with which, while the castle rocked to the foundations, and dogs howled, and lightnings flashed, the Enemy of Souls vanished in a clap of thunder.

But, if Satan be personal, we are safe, I think, in assuming that his attention is directed to higher concerns than popular superstition would have us believe.

"He begins at curfew, and walks till the first cock; he gives the web and the pin, squints the eye and makes the hare-lip; mildews the white wheat, and hurts the poor creature of earth." And though, at times, according to popular ideas, "the Prince of Darkness is a gentleman," yet, as a rule, he is a coarse conception, about whom there is only this much good to be said, that he is a *reality*, not an *abstraction*. The Eastern belief that good and evil were two co-existent and co-eternal principles, warring for ever in deadly conflict for the sovereignty of the universe, had this much to commend it, that, like the popular theory of the West, it represented this struggle as a real one. And *reality* is better, even when it takes the form of a caricature, than abstractions and shams and dreamy unrealities.

II.

We turn next to the scientific view of Satan:—"In the ecclesiastical conception of the Deity there is a fourth person in the Godhead—namely, the Devil—an outlying member, unacknowledged indeed, the complex of all evil, but as much a part of Deity as either Son or Holy Ghost, and far more powerful than all the rest, who seem but jackals to provide for this roaring lion" (Weiss, "Life of Parker," II., p. 470).

This, of course, expresses the religious view somewhat coarsely, but it prepares us to expect that such thinkers reject summarily the personality of the devil:—"Jesus shared the erroneous notions of the times respecting devils, possessions, and demonology in general" (Parker, "Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion," p. 176).

According to the philosophic creed, evil is the absence of good—and the devil is an abstraction—the embodiment, from a dramatic or fictitious point of view, of evil—namely, of the bias to wrong-doing which is innate in man himself. Sin becomes thus the outcome of the limitation in man imposed on him as part of his being, but then, we ask, "What is gained by the advocates of this theory? Whence came the evil in man if he were created by a Perfect Being?

It is hard to see what is gained by this view unless, indeed, it be a gain to establish the mythical origin of great part of Holy Scripture. The results of the evil are real; the existence of sin is real. It matters nothing to the reality whether it originated with man or with a race of beings superior to and anterior to man—*it is there*. Whence came it, and why? It may be said, "You do not explain the origin of evil by dating it backward to a previous fall of angelic beings. Granted, but neither is the mystery less profound by denying that fact, nor is it a whit more easy to account for evil as a negative principle than as a positive one. Pain, sin, suffering, death are in the world, and very positive, stern facts they are: whence came they? The philosopher cannot tell: Jesus Christ said, "An enemy hath done this." Was this enemy a poetic myth?

Rev. Henry Latham, author of "Pastor Pastorum," says that "Satan in the Temptation is an embodiment of the powers of evil," the Temptation itself, "An apologue or species of parable," p. 126; but Edersheim, in his "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," points out that throughout the Gospels there is a "constant reference to the power of Satan in the world as a kingdom opposed to that of God, and of which the devil is the king. And the reality of such a kingdom of evil no earnest mind would call in question, nor would it pronounce *à priori* against the personality of its king. Reasoning *à priori*, its credibility rests on the same kind of, only perhaps, on more generally patent evidence, as that of the beneficent Author of all good, so that—with reverence be it said—we have *apart from holy Scripture*, and as regards one branch of the argument, as much evidence for believing in a personal Satan as in a personal God" (Edersheim, I., p. 295).

It cannot be said that the account of the Temptation is a concession to Jewish demonology, for the Jews had no tradition that Messiah should undergo such a trial.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"The Fountain of Sorrow the River of Joy;" "Rizpah and Early Poems"; "Stream of Talent." London: Nisbet & Co.

In reading these poems from the pen of Canon Gilbert Beresford we are brought face to face with what seems to us precious jewels in silver settings. All three books are in the same strain. "The Fountain of Sorrow" is a continuous poem, replete with devotional thought, and entirely religious in character. "Rizpah" is the same, and the "Stream of Talent," embracing, as it does, all the great authors of ancient and modern times, is indeed a work of art. At a first perusal of any of these poems one feels disappointed, but a further and more thoughtful study brings the reader to confess that there is much beneath the surface which is both attractive and touching; two points, however, we cannot fail to notice in these poems, viz., the absence of the keynote. The subject is clear to the writer, but from his very familiarity with it he fails to give to the reader the keynote, without which the poem is lost. In "Rizpah," for instance, any reader would have to read through at least fourteen pages of poem before he would understand, even in a measure, its subject. The addition of the Scriptural passage at the beginning would, we think, have been an improvement. The earlier and other poems strike us as by far the most attractive portions. We said before that these poems seemed like diamonds set in silver, for whilst teeming with thoughts truly poetic in nature, and whilst the flow of language is admirable, the rythme is not always of the same excellence. On p. 79 of "Rizpah," for instance, one is struck with the little song in its entirety, whereas on page 62, "The Brook," line 5, "And says come let the sun shine or not," etc., seems poor.

Again, in the "Fountain of Sorrow," p. 141, line 45, we are struck with the expression, "Imperishable life —or if to die. Imperishable death—a deathless soul which in its time is spoilt." Two lines lower, by "Life with the Life-giver, then commensurate." In the "Turkish Captive's Lament," we fail to understand why the author speaks of Afric's sun and waves burning on the coast of Italy. To conclude, we should

like to see these poems more read and studied, for we believe them to be of no ordinary quality, and worthy of being handed down to posterity. They denote a mind of unusual force, and, withal, of keen delicacy of conception. They improve upon acquaintance, and are books, both in appearance and contents, worthy of every drawing-room.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"GENERAL" BOOTH'S PROPAGANDA.

SIR,—When I read your Editorial on "'General' Booth's Propaganda," in CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT, Oct. 25th, I thought of "Charity thinketh no evil," but it seems equally true that envy thinketh *only* evil, and when you charitably attribute the Christlike work which General Booth has been enabled to do for the last twenty-five years, to the "promptings of Anti-Christ!" it is a sad illustration of that truth. Feeding the hungry, restoring the prodigals, lifting up the down-trodden, and reclaiming the drunkard and harlot, are not the indications of the presence of Anti-Christ which I have been taught to look for, wherever you have got your instruction from. As a Churchman, I feel ashamed that while General Booth is engaged in such a noble work, you, and others, are doing yours by throwing dirt at him. T. HOBBS, Lieut.-Col.

Penshurst, Netley, Hants,
November 19th, 1890.

[We have recorded our experience of the Salvation Army during the past ten or twelve years, we have spent an "All night with Jesus" at its head quarters, we have visited its Refuges and Training Homes; and we deliberately state that they are not to be compared in efficiency to other Refuges. As to the Training Home, we did expect to see some kind of work being done by the young women in it, but were told that their time was wholly devoted to music and singing, and selling "War Cries," or collecting money in the streets. We are glad to see that the General proposes to set the "submerged tenth" to *work*, and inasmuch as they have, in London at least, been submerged by *street trading*—the most demoralising occupation—in its manifold branches, we trust that he, or the local authorities, will see the advantage of setting a good example, and withdrawing the Salvation Lasses from selling "War Cries" and begging in the streets.—ED.]

PRIVATE ABSOLUTION.

SIR,—The article on Absolution, in this week's PULPIT, in respect of literary composition, is such as would not be creditable to a junior freshman. In one sentence, the Prayer Book is called both "it" and "she." The whole thing is slovenly and inconsequent. As a piece of reasoning and exposition, it is in proportion to its style. Absolution, we are told, although sacramental, is not a sacrament, because it has no outward means—visible sign evidently being meant; and in the next paragraph the Homily quoted speaks of the visible sign, the imposition of hands. Now Absolution is not a sacrament certainly; but it is not the want of a visible sign that absolutely prevents it from being so, but the want of a sign ordained by God; *vide* Art. 25. Next, your correspondent gives an extract from one of Cranmer's sermons, and comments on it by saying that Cranmer does not teach what he does teach most distinctly. (I am inclined to think that this is one of Cranmer's earlier sermons, and that it is of no value in enabling us to understand the intentions of its author as a Reformer). Then we are told that as Cranmer was one of the compilers of the Prayer Book, those who do not agree with your correspondent have very little authority on which to rely. Then after this, the idea that the Absolution in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick is an absolution from Church censure, is condemned as absurd. However, as this absurdity is taught by Hooker in the sixth book of "Ecclesiastical Polity," the unfortunate persons who do not agree with your writer, have some authority here.

If this article had no faults but bad composition, bad grammar, and bad logic, it might be left without remark to great advantage. But it has a far worse fault. At the time when the Irish Church had to revise its constitution, nearly twenty years ago, there was scarcely a service of our Prayer Book that was not subjected to discussion. Many influential persons were anxious at that time to alter the Ordinal, bringing it into harmony with the mode of conveying orders that prevailed in the Universal Church in all its branches till the twelfth century, and that still prevails in all the East. Whether your correspondent is aware of it or not, there are many considerations of great weight capable of being advanced in favour of such a change. And whether he is aware of this or not, he is not entitled to launch out into virulent vituperation against those who desired such a change. When and where did the late Archdeacon Lee call the Irish Synod a den of thieves? I put this into English so as to have no mistake about its silly vulgarity. Why is it blasphemous to object to—not our Lord's words, as your correspondent represents—but to a supposed misapplication of our Lord's words? How does your writer know that the late Sir Joseph Napier preferred policy to party theology? Does he know that Sir Joseph Napier was the author of a most able argument against any change in the Ordinal? An argument crowded with learned reasoning, which I am quite sure your writer is utterly incapable of appreciating.

To complete this composition, and to make it all of a piece in absurdity, bad reasoning, and unmistakable animus, it concludes with saying that the Protestant people of Ireland are incapable of managing their affairs, *because* this proposal to modify the Ordination Service was not adopted. Reasonable persons are in the habit of thinking that the affairs of the Irish Church are pretty well administered. Your correspondent is evidently an Irishman; perhaps he has never been consulted, as he thought he should have been, in Church matters. If so it will account for his fury and venom. I hope we have now seen the last of this trash, of which there has been, permit me to say, now and then, too much for ordinary tastes in your columns.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

SIR,—In reference to the letter of "J. B." in your to-day's paper. I beg to be allowed to say that the maxims and definitions of Adam Smith, J. S. Mill, and Mr. Fawcett, on economical subjects, are entirely out of date and exploded. Those economists were great men, and useful in their time; but their systems

are no more to be accepted than the astronomical systems of Ptolemy, and Copernicus *versus* Kepler and Newton. Take even their language and analyse it. What meaning has the opening sentence of the "Wealth of Nations"? "The annual labour of every nation is the fund," etc. How is, or how can be, labour a fund? And what does "annual labour" mean? As for Mill, his first words directly contradict what seems to be your correspondent's idea. "The requisites of production (that is the production of wealth) are two: labour, and appropriate natural objects." That is, both are necessary; and why should one, in precedence of the other, have the quality ascribed to it of being the universal agent?

I did not say that economists disagree as to the paramount importance of labour. I said that "economists are not generally agreed that labour is the universal agent that produces wealth." All sound economists now accept the doctrine, that the only Cause of Value is Demand; and the wonder is, that when people see the fact before them, every time that they buy a pound of tea or a yard of tape, that its value to them, commercially, is just that they are willing to give so and so for it, they can seriously deny the doctrine.

Let me go on and examine another of your correspondent's quotations. Mr. Fawcett says that "the production of every species of wealth requires the application of man's labour"; and he goes on to remark that coal is not available till dug. But coal is worth money, in the shape of a royalty or otherwise, before it is ever dug. As for the whale stranded, the very question that "J. B." puts shows the fallacy of his contention. The whale was worth money—was wealth—had value—before any labour was laid out on cutting it up and boiling it down.

Economics is a science, like astronomy, and to mix up economics with morals, except in the true and scientific bearing of the two subjects on themselves, is akin to that fallacy which Macaulay exposed when he spoke of Protestant cookery and Christian horsemanship. "Business is business, and morals are morals; quite distinct." Perfectly true. But all things of science and of human knowledge and interest are capable of being put to good moral uses. B.

13th December, 1890.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—I do not know how to regard Mr. Lawrence's letter. The subject under discussion is the one at the head of this letter, to which there is not the slightest reference in all that he says. Everybody believes that God answers prayer. This is not in question. I think before the writer makes an assertion he should know whereof he asserts. He thinks I am not fit to administer baptism, because I do not hold the doctrine of Sacramental Grace. Of these things he is not in a position to judge. He should first say what is Sacramental Grace, and then show that I do not hold it. But is Confirmation a Sacrament?

I have not said that faith is a faculty of the human mind. I have said as distinctly as I could that it is a faculty of the Spirit. All have not faith. This is scriptural teaching. Mr. Lawrence said, and now reiterates it, that I wrote faith is the opposite of reason. I said nothing of the kind. He says now that I wrote superstition is the opposite of faith. Superstition is the outcome of perverted reason. It is an abuse of language to call it perverted faith. I am afraid I ought to suggest to Mr. Lawrence the propriety of distinguishing between things that differ.

May I just say one word to your other correspondent? It is very easy, if that were sufficient, to explain to candidates for Confirmation the part which seems to puzzle him as easy as to explain anything else. We can only teach. We cannot give grace. Grace alone can make things right. God gives grace. Do we make darkness greater by assuming power we do not possess? This is the main point for us. After that, it is ours only to sow the seed.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Dec. 6th, 1890.

SIR,—I have only time to-day to correct Mr. Lawrence's mis-quotation of my words. I never said that "to speak of confirmed persons as confirmed was a grievous falsehood." I said that "to speak of persons" (such as those about whom I was writing) "as confirmed was a grievous falsehood." And to that opinion I adhere. I am no believer in *opus operatum*.

A CLERGYMAN FOR FORTY YEARS.

Dec. 7th.

ST. LUKE AND THE LXX.

SIR,—In a recent number of the PULPIT (Dec. 6th) Dr. Plummer, in a letter with the above heading, propounds the question: "Is it credible that a well-educated Gentile Christian, who had lived for years at the side of St. Paul, constantly hearing his instruction to Jews and Jewish Christians, both in public and in private, and constantly conversing with him about the relation between Judaism and Christianity, could avoid becoming very familiar with the Septuagint"?

The critic naturally wonders what can be the name of this well-educated Gentile Christian as to whom ecclesiastical history is so totally silent, and why Dr. Plummer should evolve him out of his inner consciousness, and describe him with such splendid imaginative power. Clearly the individual referred to cannot be St. Luke; for, 1, St. Paul does not once allude to Luke in any of his epistles till near the close of his career—that is, till writing from Rome to the Colossians, in A.D. 62. St. Paul *did* choose Timothy "to go forth with him" (Acts xvi.), and Timothy did "as a son with the father serve with him in the Gospel" (Phil. ii.); but Luke?—there is not a single shred of valid historic evidence that St. Paul had ever seen Luke before he met him in Rome two or three years before his martyrdom.

2. Moreover, according to the commonly received (though *erroneous*) view, "Luke seems to have stayed at Philippi for about seven years" (Farrar, "Messages of the Book," p. 72), that is, for seven of the most important years of St. Paul's life and ministry. How then could Luke, *seven years absent* from St. Paul, "constantly hear," as Dr. Plummer suggests, "his instructions to Jews and Jewish Christians, both in public and private"? It does not appear that such a method of tuition would have resulted in Luke's making much progress in his Septuagintal studies.

3. The Jews, view of St. Paul was, "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live" (Acts xxii. 22); and early in his career, when the Jews opposed his preaching, and blasphemed, "He shook his raiment and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I

will go unto the Gentiles" (Acts xviii. 6). And as to the Jewish Christians who denied that St. Paul was a true Apostle, and who viewed his proceedings with disgust and alarm, his "withstanding St. Peter to the face" at Antioch (Gal. ii.), and his "sharp contention" with Barnabas (Acts xv.) would not be likely to recommend him to these Judaizers, or to send them flocking to him for counsel and instruction. As a matter of fact *only three* Jewish Christians in all Rome could be found to countenance St. Paul (Col. iv.).

4. Lastly, it is, of course, as utterly impossible to turn a Gentile into a Jew as it is to turn a Sûdra into a Brahmin; and it is as absurd to mistake a Gentile for a Jew as to mistake a Dutchman for a Frenchman. The author of the Third Gospel is not only familiar with the LXX., but a *born Jew*, who thinks *Hebraistically* as well as writes *Hellenistically*, and who had been necessarily familiar with the LXX. from his earliest youth.

H. HEBER EVANS.

December 9th, 1890

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baynes, Rev. M. C., M.A., Vicar of Crondal, Hants.
Cosgrave, W. F., M.A., Vicar of Hunwick; Vicar of St. John's, Sunderland.
Cotes, Rev. W. H., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Westbury-on-Trym; Vicar of Up Hatherley, Cheltenham, and Diocesan Inspector for the Archdeaconries of Gloucester and Cirencester.
Davies, Rev. Daniel, B.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Bangor; Vicar of St. Asaph.
Fisher, Rev. Francis Walter, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Epiphany Mission-room in the Parish of St. Andrew's, Stockwell-green.
Grant, Rev. Cyril Fletcher, M.A., Vicar of Aylesford; Honorary Canon of Rochester Cathedral.
Kingdom, Rev. E. W. S., Vicar of Christ Church, Lowestoft; Vicar of St. Mary's, Leamington.
Lampen, Rev. C. Dudley, Vicar of Eastry, Dover; Chaplain to the Eastry Union.
Leonard, Rev. Arthur Allen, M.A., Vicar of Beaminster, Dorset; Surrogate for the Diocese of Salisbury.
Lloyd, Rev. Thomas, Diocesan Missioner for the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Luckman, Rev. A. C., Chaplain of Naini Tal.
Macdona, Rev. A. M. O., Assistant Curate of St. Paul's, St. Leonard's; Rector of St. Clement's, Halton, Hastings.
Macdona, Rev. Locke, Curate of Putney; Vicar of All Saints', Cheadle Hulme.
MacMichael, Rev. Charles, B.A., Rector of Walpole St. Peter, Norfolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Amphlett, Rev. Joseph. for fifty-six years Rector of the parish, at Hampton Lovett, in the County of Worcester, on the 15th inst., aged 90.
Blewitt, Rev. Charles, at Old Rectory, Swardestone, on the 9th inst., aged 89.
Ferrall. Rev. Charles Whitworth, M.A., late Vicar of Langtoft, at Wing on the 11th inst., aged 71.
Jemmett. Rev. George, M.A., at Ottawa, suddenly, on the 18th ult., aged 64.
Marsden, Rev. Thomas, late Rector of St. John's, Horsleydown, at Leigh Bank, Sutton, on the 13th inst., aged 80.
Paske, Rev. T. J., Rector, at Creeting St. Peter, on the 11th inst., aged 61.
Polehampton, Rev. Edward Thomas William, for thirty-one years Rector of the parish, at Hartfield Rectory, Sussex, on the 8th inst., aged 67.
Roberts, Rev. W. Pender, formerly Rector of Trevalga, Cornwall, at Carmarthen, South Wales, on the 7th inst.
Wright, Rev. H. E., Rector of Vange, on the 9th inst., aged 82.

A BOOK FOR MEN AND WOMEN.

A little book of considerable interest to both men and women is published (gratis) by the Medical Battery Co., Limited, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. It is carefully compiled, and contains much valuable information on "The Remarkable Curative Action of Electricity," with a special chapter on Mr. Harness' genuine Electropathic Belt Appliances. Those who cannot call should write at once to the above address before they forget it. A copy, with book of testimonials, will be sent post free on application.

MR. MIDDLETON'S REMARKABLE CASE.

The case of Mr. George Middleton is worthy of the most careful consideration. Writing from 66, Holborn Viaduct, he explains how one of Mr. Harness' Electropathic Belts completely cured him of severe organic weakness and general debility, after the leading London physicians had failed to do him any good. In a long letter of gratitude he describes the result as "astonishing," and says that he now has "a good appetite," is "able to walk in comfort," and gets "good sleep at night." He further states that he will be glad to answer any enquiries, or do anything in his power to bring these genuine and convenient electric appliances more prominently before the notice of his suffering fellow-creatures. Thousands of similar testimonials have been received from all parts of the world and from all classes of society, copies of which are published in book form, and may be had free by post on application to the Medical Battery Company, Limited, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. Any of our readers who may be suffering from nervous exhaustion, organic weakness, physical debility, impaired vitality, melancholia, hypochondriasis, indigestion, gout, rheumatism, sciatica, lumbago, epilepsy, torpid liver, hysteria, kidney diseases sleeplessness, loss of appetite, rupture, corpulency, &c., should not fail to call, if possible, at the Company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation. Those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call, should communicate by letter without delay, when a descriptive illustrated pamphlet and private consultation form will be sent them gratis and post free to any address. We may add that this palatial establishment is the largest and only complete electro-therapeutic in the world, and the public should avoid all fraudulent and worthless imitations. Note carefully that the Company's only address is 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), where their officers are in daily attendance from 9 a.m. to 6.30 p.m.; Saturdays till 4 p.m.

The Church of England Pulpit.

ST. MATTHEW.

By the Rev. SINCLAIR CAROLIN, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Denmark Hill.

Sermon preached in St. Matthew's.

"After these things he went forth, and saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he said unto him, Follow me. And he left all, rose up, and followed him."—Luke v. 27, 28.

LEVI, the son of Alphæus (as St. Mark, in relating the incident which I have just read to you, informs us), was a tax-gatherer of the town of Capernaum, in the tetrarchy of Galilee. His duties possibly may have been those of collecting the customs from the merchants going down South, from the town of Damascus, and receiving tolls from the extensive fisheries on the sea of Galilee. In this occupation he was engaged when he got from Jesus that summons which he so instantly and cheerfully obeyed.

Doubtless he had before heard and seen the great Master, he had caught those words, unmatched for sweet persuasiveness, that dropped from the mouth of Jesus, like honey from the honeycomb; he had seen those mighty acts, with which again and again the gracious Prophet of Nazareth plied the hardened unbelieving hearts and understandings of his fellow-countrymen. He was ready at the word of invitation to surrender all for Christ; that word came to him in due course; and Levi, hearing it, rose up, and followed Jesus. With the change of calling came a change of name. The old name, Levi, was dropped, and "Matthew"—a Hebrew word signifying "Gift of God"—was adopted in its place. As with Saul and Simon, so also with Levi, the new life was ushered in with a new name. On the same day that he was called, Levi, or as we must now call him Matthew, made a great feast at his house, to which he invited Jesus and His disciples, and there, surrounded by a crowd of publicans and sinners, our blessed Saviour once more proclaimed the glad tidings of His Gospel, tidings glad indeed and welcome to the weary and sin-laden souls that listened as He spake. Then Matthew heard the words which he has recorded for our learning and our comfort: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."

After this we find no mention of Matthew in the Gospel story, save when his name occurs in the list of the Twelve Apostles; nor is there any special reference to him in the Acts, or in the Epistles. These few particulars are all that we can glean from the pages of the Bible concerning Matthew the publican. But by considering them carefully we may, I think, arrive at a few more or less probable conclusions regarding his character and religious position. And, in the first place, we must not forget that it was in the service of Herod and not in that of the Roman government that Matthew had lived as tax-gatherer. Capernaum was in the tetrarchy of Galilee, which at the time of St. Matthew's call was still at least nominally free, and under the government of Antipas, son of King Herod the Great. Now, we must remember that this Herod the Great had always claimed to be in some measure of Jewish race. In strictness he was an Idumæan, a son of Esau or Edom, and therefore not of course a stranger and a Gentile in the same sense as a Roman would be. But besides this, in the lapse of time, Idumæa had mingled with Israel There had been much intercourse and intermixture between the two kindred nations, so that the Herodian dynasty might not unreasonably demand to be regarded as in some sort a national line. And we know that at this time there did actually exist a half-political, half-religious sect or party, who did so regard the family of Herod the Great, and who had come to look to it for the fulfilment of the national Messianic hopes. It was possible then at once to be in the service of Herod Antipas, and to cherish and cling around the highest aspirations of the Hebrew race. For why might there not arise in after-times some prince of the Herodian line, whose mission it should be to restore the kingdom to Israel? Why might not the two royal houses of Herod and of David be united in the person of some future king, whose career should be the fulfilment of all that Moses and the Prophets had written concerning the Christ. Plainly the thing was not impossible; and we know from the history of St. Matthew's times that there was a large and influential party amongst the Jews, the Herodians, who entertained hopes of such a consummation as that I have indicated. Now any one who reads St. Matthew's Gospel with attention cannot fail to be struck with the fact that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, extensively read and entirely absorbed in the history and the prophecies of his own people, and anxiously expecting the fulfilment of these latter. Is it not then probable that Matthew was one of those Jews who looked to the Herodian dynasty as the source from which Messiah was to spring? Such a theory is, I think, supported by the fact that he had accepted employment under a prince of the Herodian line. The odious nature of this employment proves that Matthew must have been under the influence of the master-passion of his race, the desire of gain; and its sedentary character would seem to indicate that he who pursued it loved a life of contemplation and inaction,

rather than to participate in the rash and restless schemes of the political adventurers, in whose midst he lived. How congenial to this money-loving, contemplative Jew, must have been the theory which pointed to the reigning house of Herod as the quarter in which the Messianic hopes were likely to be realised. Such had in all probability been the hopes and belief of Levi. But when the words of Jesus fell upon his ear, it was not long before they penetrated to his heart, fully stored as it was, with national memories and hopes, and were apprehended by him in all their surpassing beauty and completeness. He saw how exactly, and in every particular, the sayings and the doings of Jesus corresponded with what Moses and the Prophets had written concerning the Messiah. And so without delay he accepted the view of the kingdom of God which Jesus inculcated. To the cause of the Nazarene he yielded himself at once and wholly, giving up calling and friends for his sake, and counting all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus.

And having surrendered all for Christ, he was content to be an humble, silent, unobtrusive follower of his great Master. As has already been remarked, we read in the New Testament of nothing which specially concerns St. Matthew, save the accounts of his call, and of the feast which he made on the same day to Jesus and His following.

He was not one of that little chosen band of three that accompanied our Lord throughout the most remarkable occasions of his triumph and of his humiliation. No stories are grouped about his name: no speech of his to Christ is recorded. When he received his summons he rose up and followed in silence, doubtless rapt in contemplation of the strange yet unmistakeable fulfilment of the ancient prophecies in Christ. And this quiet, undemonstrative character he preserved to the last, thus showing in the strongest contrast to the ardent and mercurial apostle St. Peter. Nevertheless the silence of St. Matthew was golden; it bore abundant fruit in the shape of the Gospel which has come down to us from his pen, and to which we turn as the great storehouse of proofs from prophecy. I will conclude this brief notice of St. Matthew by quoting a sentence or two from one of his latest editors and commentators. "It is characteristic of this silent, unmarked life, in which the personality of the Evangelist is lost in the voice of the message which he was inspired to utter, that St. Matthew's name has been less prominent in the Churches and nations of Christendom than others of his fellow-apostles, or even than many saints whose services to the Church of Christ have been infinitely less. None of the great Churches of Christendom have been called by his name, no guild or fraternity, no college in our great Universities, no state or nation, has chosen him for a patron. The personal memory, like the personal life of St. Matthew, withdraws itself from the observation of men."

And now a brief word concerning the practical lessons to be learned from the story of St. Matthew's call. In the first place we have in it a signal example set us of the way in which we all should obey the gracious summons of Christ. How often is that summons sounded in the ears of those who are living, self-seeking, self-involved, un-Christ-like lives; how often does it penetrate through the outward ear to the heart and conscience, and cause a pang of misgiving and remorse to wring the heart of the covetous and unloving worshipper of this world's good? But it will avail little if the invitation thus given produce in such a one nothing further than a transitory occasional pang. If that is all the effect it has on him, he will be in the position of the young man who went away sorrowing from the gentle yet firm counsels of Jesus back again to his old love Mammon. If we wish to be the better for this invitation, if we desire to take advantage of it, the only way in which we can do this is by forsaking all to follow Christ. Brethren, this is a hard saying; hard for our worldly selves to take home; hard for our eager clamorous passions to allow and admit—nay, impossible, were it not for the aid of God's holy spirit, which He is always ready to grant us to assist us in conquering our lower nature, if only we call upon Him in the hour of our need. Let us therefore pray to Him for grace to forsake all covetous desires and inordinate love of this world, and to follow Christ in our daily walk and conversation, to follow in the footsteps of His humanity, His self-forgetfulness, His pure and ardent love towards all mankind, being assured that if we so pray without ceasing, and not only pray but struggle—struggle hard and long against sin and self—we shall in time rise from the base life of the past to the serene heights of the mature Christian's walk, in which every step taken is taken under the guidance of the Divine light within the soul. Again, if what I have said concerning Matthew's religious views before his call be true, we see in him an example of one whose views have been formed under the perverting influence of self-interest. Matthew looked in all probability to the Herodian line for the fulfilment of the Messianic hopes of his people. But we have seen that this point of view harmonised and fell in with that covetous and avaricious bent which had led him to engage in a vocation held in abhorrence by the great mass of his people. Thus his creed received a certain colour from his passions; his religious belief was moulded under the influence of his own personal feelings and interests. And do we not see instances of this at the present day? Do we not occasionally meet people who, anxious to reconcile the demands of religion with the claims of self, adopt some form of religious profession which seems to them to allow a wider and more general indulgence of their own desires than any other? I am fully persuaded that to this cause is largely due the multiplication of religious sects amongst us. Men

see in the old forms no room left for the indulgence of private individual will, and so they—perhaps unconsciously—set about throwing their religion into some other form that will admit of more license in this respect; they endeavour to set themselves free from the restrictions of the already established modes of belief, and to secure a larger power of self-indulgence by setting up for themselves a new creed and system. Or else in determining their choice amongst the already existing systems they allow themselves to be biassed by considerations of self-interest rather than come boldly to the task of selection with the single-minded desire to attain the purest and most unmixed truth. In this way St. Matthew seems to have acted, when under the influence of his money-loving bent, he allowed himself to be misled into the views of those who looked for a Messiah of the house and lineage of Herod. But then, when the call came to him, he shook himself free from these perverted notions; he embraced without delay the pure unmixed truth of Christ's doctrine, renouncing those opinions which had been so congenial to his natural temperament, and not allowing his individual bias to interfere any further in determining the form of his belief. In this respect, too, he is worthy of all praise, and worthy of all imitation; and we may, all of us, learn from him a lesson of candour in the matter of our religious professions and beliefs, a lesson which appears to be especially needed in these times of ours when influences so many and so various are brought to bear upon us during the growth and development of our religious views, and when that which is true is not always or often that which is popular or profitable.

THE TRIUMPH OF PATIENCE.

By the Rev. J. SELLER, Curate of St. Mary's, Elland.

Sermon Preached in St. Mary's Church, Elland, Yorkshire, on Sunday Evening, October 12th, 1890.

"In yourpatience possess ye your souls."—St. Luke xxi. 19.

"In your patience ye shall win your souls." (R.V.)

THESE words were uttered by our Lord almost on the eve of His Passion. They follow immediately on the words spoken concerning the Temple and the character of the times preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. Those would, indeed, be days of great distress and uncertainty. Not only would there be great earthquakes, famines, and pestilences, terrors, and great signs from heaven; but Christ's own disciples would share deeply in the sufferings of those days. "They shall lay their hands on you and shall persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons, bringing you before kings and governors for My name's sake." "But a greater trial awaits you than mere persecution from without. The strife of creeds will enter even the sacred circle of the family; the father will give evidence before the Courts against his own child, the brother against the brother, the child against the parent, the friend against the friend. The fury of heathen and Jewish fanaticism will feel no pity: the nearest blood will rage against its own, and will deliver them up to the executioner. And even in your own number many will renounce their faith under the pressure of persecution and trial, and will even betray and deliver up their fellow Christians to the magistrate. My name will indeed become a symbol of hatred and scorn against every one who confesses it. Still worse, many false Christian teachers will rise in your own bosom, and will mislead numbers. And all this spiritual corruption will sap the brotherly love and religious zeal of great numbers of My followers, for true Christian life cannot thrive where there is moral decay. But he who neither renounces My name, nor lets himself be led astray by false teachers, but remains true and loyal to Me, till the evil days are over, will receive everlasting honour at My final coming." "In your patience ye shall win your souls."

These words, then, had a very important meaning for those disciples, and, indeed, for Christ's followers in that and every age. They were meant for such only, for the guidance and comfort of those who had left all and followed Him. However fiery might be the coming trials, however slow the progress of Christ's kingdom—the spread of holiness and righteousness amongst men; however great the difficulties and perplexities and discouragements which would confront their faith and test their fidelity to their Lord, still it would ever remain true for them and for all successive generations of God's own children. "In your patience ye shall win your souls."

And, first, dear brethren, these words hold true respecting the progress and issue of our own individual spiritual life. That life is conditioned and largely influenced by the limitations and circumstances of our present state of existence. Every true child of God, every one who is intensely desirous of glorifying Christ in his whole life and conduct, knows and feels this—feels how much there is within and without which makes it far from easy to grow in grace and love, to follow Him fully day by day. When, after long struggling with some old temptation, we think we have overcome it for ever, suddenly when we least suspect it, it returns in all its old fierceness and power, and we find ourselves again amid the din and smoke of battle—"the flesh" warring against "the spirit," and "the spirit" against "the flesh." At such times even the best among us may be tempted to doubt whether after all he is making any decided progress in the Christ life; and we wonder with fear as to the final issue. Yet

even here we may hear the Master and Saviour saying: "In your patience ye shall win your souls." Just as there is with too many around us, an utter carelessness and indifference to spiritual and eternal things, so, on the other hand there may be an over-carefulness—a morbid anxiety—about the inward life which disturbs and hinders the soul in its spiritual growth. And then we find so much around us, it may be persons and things we come in contact with, almost every day, which frets and worries, which throws us down and bruises us in our striving after the high and the holy, that we are in danger at such times of losing heart and sinking in black despair.

Ah, my brethren, we all, who are really following Christ, know something of this. But let us bear in mind that great saints—holy and Christ-like characters—like the great works of the artist and the sculptor, are not fashioned and perfected in a day. These very trials and temptations and difficulties of ours, which seem at present hindrances rather than helps may—if we continue faithful—serve to produce in us by His grace, a more perfect resemblance to the Blessed Lord, a more robust Christian character, than we might have otherwise reached. Only there must be patience; by the loving exercise of this, we shall win our souls—our truest, highest life. It was thus that God's children of old fought and endured, and triumphed: "and the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice. . . . Here is the patience of the saints."

But these words have also a meaning—a very direct and vital meaning too—for us as Christian thinkers and workers. We live in an age of great transition of thought: never was the advanced and ever-advancing march of Christian and scientific thought so manifest as it is to-day. Never was the Bible and the whole body of Christian Truth being studied by so many cultured minds as it is to-day. Everywhere Theologians and Scientists, Preachers and Teachers, are being drawn into closer fellowship and sympathy through one common bond and object—the true conception and presentation of the Truth as one complete whole, and the due relation of its different parts or aspects to each other. Some of us remember the time when the Christian Church—I do not refer particularly to the Church of England—was so suspicious and intolerant of the discoveries and deductions of science, so intensely conservative of her old narrow and rigid systems of theology, so thoroughly enslaved to the past, that for long she refused to sanction or encourage opinions and doctrines which seemed to her calculated to destroy the very foundations of the faith. But there were a few far-seeing Christians who possessed their souls in patience. They said, "Let us wait, let us not condemn hastily what seems so strangely to contradict the literal meaning of the Mosaic account of Creation, neither let us reject all at once the doctrines and criticisms of this new and liberal school of Theology; but, bearing in mind, that the God of Nature and of Revelation is the same eternal God, and that the true study of Nature must ever lead to faith in Nature's God, let us possess our souls in patience." What, I would ask, has been the result to the Church at large? Have the gloomy and fearful prophecies of the old and narrow interpreters of Christian Truth been realised? Does the Church hold less clearly and firmly than she ever did the great truths of Divine Revelation? No, but by her patience and forbearance she is winning ever more and more her highest, deepest, and truest life. True Science and Theology have ceased to be regarded as deadly, irreconcilable, enemies; each when properly conducted contributes to the glory and perfection of the other: "Ephraim no longer envies Judah, nor does Judah vex Ephraim."

It is true there yet remains much—very much—to be done. This more accurate, more rational, and sober, and common-sense method of interpreting and presenting Christian Truth is but in its infancy. In able hands and with proper safeguards it will no doubt lead to great and permanent results. It will succeed in destroying for ever those narrow and rigid and artificial systems of Interpretation and Theology which in the past have helped so much to isolate and weaken the Church; it will leave to the unbeliever far fewer grounds of objection to the Bible as being a revelation in history of a gracious purpose of God towards the human race: it will enable the Church to become more and more a truly Catholic Church—as wide and universal in her aims and sympathies as is the truth itself. "Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free." But all this may as yet seem very distant. Meanwhile for each of us, the Master's words hold true; our duty and strength alike lie in possessing our souls in patience. The Truth may be assailed in a thousand ways, our own faith, too, be sorely tried, but let us hold fast by God. The rocks around our native land have seen many a storm, yet they abide; and though the Truth be violently and persistently attacked, we may possess our souls in Christ-like patience, knowing that, like its Divine Author, Truth is eternal.

So too, dear brethren, in all Christian work these words hold good. The Christian worker is apt at times to be a little disheartened as he sees the slow visible advance of the Kingdom of God around him. The Preacher and Teacher and Christian Socialist are subject now and then to these feelings of—not despair—but discouragement. We think of the more than eighteen centuries which have elapsed since the Day of Pentecost and the establishing of the Christian Church; and then we look out on the world, and see how small a portion of it is even nominally Christian. Perhaps we take a more limited view; we look around our own district or parish and tremble to think how few there are who are striving "to enter in at the strait gate." But some of us are in still closer contact with

Christian work; in some humble yet real sense, "we are workers together with God." And every department of Church work has its discouraging side. We long, perhaps, to see more visible fruit of our labours, more manifest tokens of God's Presence with us in the work. Our labours seem to come to nothing. We are always breaking up the hard, rough, fallow-ground, always sowing, never reaping. Yet even here, dear brethren, "In your patience ye shall win your souls." By this we shall not only win our own highest and truest life, we shall realise also the most blessed and abiding results of our labours in the Master's Vineyard. Though some sow and others reap, though we see no fruit of all our pain and toil, yet let us not think that the patient, faithful labours of the sower are followed by a less glorious reward than is the work of him who seems to be ever returning, "bringing his sheaves with him."

The glad time is coming when both the sower and the reaper shall rejoice together. Let us, therefore, pray for more of this all-conquering grace of patience. We need it everywhere—in the home, the school, the Church, the world, to enable us not only to conquer ourselves but also to help us to bear and do His blessed will. How much more smoothly and easily would the vast machinery of Christian work move if only each worker was always endeavouring to possess his or her soul "in patience"! True, there may be, there *is*, much to irritate and dishearten and perplex; but what was true for the disciples in the old days is as true to-day for you and me—if only we have ears to hear and faith to follow. "In your patience ye shall win your souls."

It is officially announced that the Queen has appointed the Rev. Canon Edgar Jacob, vicar of Portsea, Hampshire, and Honorary Chaplain to her Majesty, to be one of the Chaplains in Ordinary to her Majesty. The Queen has also appointed the Rev. David Robertson, Rector of Hartlebury, Kidderminster, Worcestershire, to be one of the Honorary Chaplains to her Majesty.

Schinos.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXIX. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1890.

CHRISTMAS CAROLS.

LOITERING about the avenues leading to St. Paul's Cathedral may sometimes be seen, a few days before Christmas, a scrubby fellow, in tattered garments, hawking Christmas Carols. Some dim idea of latent suitability appears to attract him to the purlieus of the great Cathedral, whose huge dome looms out above him through the fog, or some reminiscence, it may be, of the ancient order of clerks—those pioneers of literature who engrossed amulets and pious prayers in Paternoster Row and Ave Maria Lane hard by. His broad sheet, as the purchaser will find, contains only a few coarsely printed Christmas hymns such as are familiar to everyone. A rude woodcut in the centre, representing the manger at Bethlehem, another of the crucifixion, and a few religious blocks, picked out without regard to the letter-press, from the printer's odds and ends, highly coloured—after the manner of our old friend, the panorama of the Lord Mayor's Show—adorn this topographic masterpiece.

Poor, however, as the vendor and his wares may be, he is a lingering remnant of the itinerant band who, in the days of our grandfathers, trudged the weary country through, singing and selling their way from village to village, and, therefore, deserving a modicum of respect and patronage.

Christmas Carols have fallen upon evil days; their glory has departed. What sentiment could stand the wear and tear to ear and brain occasioned by the tribe of noisy urchins who howl at our doorsteps for halfpence, from the shady end of October till we are well on in the new year? Few of us can dissociate the song from the street singer. Our friend Robin himself, had he been a silly barn fowl instead of tight little red waistcoated warbler,

would not touch our hearts as he does with his cheery song.

Carols sung in our village church by "Six little singing boys, dear little souls, in nice clean faces and nice white stoles," are all very well, but the same, whined out by a sanctimonious beggar at the street corner, are not quite identical.

Apart, however, from associations, some of the old carols possess wonderful vitality. "God rest you, merry gentlemen," is redolent of roast beef, yule logs, holly berries, and the hospitable crackle of the Christmas fire. He must be a very hard-faced Ebenezer Scrooge who can shut out the thought of poor Lazarus at the gate, when December winds are whistling round his gables. Some such idea seems to have suggested to an ancient ballad-maker the aptitude of the parable of Dives and Lazarus for Christmas singing. When the writer comes to the Nemesis of fortune, he begins to gloat on the turning of the tables:—

"As it fell out, upon a day,
Rich Dives sicken'd and died,
There came two serpents out of hell,
His soul therein to guide.
'Rise up, rise up, brother Dives,
And come along with me,
For you've a place provided in hell
To sit upon a serpent's knee."

How would the blue-nosed singer drawl out that "Serpent's knee," under the bedroom window of snug old Money-bags on a Christmas eve? Apart from the poet's conception of a snake's anatomy, there is something human in his indignation at the callous fellow in purple and linen who had the impudence to fare sumptiously every day, while he, in Grub Street, found, like Trotty Veck, nothing came round more regularly than dinner-time, and nothing less regularly than dinner.

One would have thought Christ's coming in great humility to bless both "hut and hall," as the carol says, would have brought rich and poor together long ago. It was "hut and hall" then without any intermediate middle-class villas. "Hall" has to wend its way now through an interminable vista of diminishing gentilities before it finds "hut" in the back slums. That is not the fault of the carol singers, however. They rejoiced in homely wise over the poverty of Him who, for our sakes, became poor. One of them makes the angelic host explain to the shepherds—

"He neither shall be clothed
In purple nor in pall,
But all in fair linen
As were babies all.

"He neither shall be rocked
In silver or in gold,
But in a wooden cradle
That rocks on the mould."

If well-to-do people would allow their sympathies a little more liberty, they would understand better the godly, Christian communistic character of the old carols, thereby removing the *raison d'être* of much feeble radicalism, and windy philanthropy.

But here lie the difficulties. Every year that we pass amongst the conventionalities of modern society we draw a fresh bolt upon the imprisoned manhood in us, till at last our soul is shut in upon itself, falls on sleep, and sleeps so soundly, undisturbed by dreams of poverty, with its sad wan face, that death steals in without the real warm brotherly heart of us finding a chance of expressing itself at all.

THE PERSONALITY OF SATAN.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Rector of Warrenpoint.

(*Continued from page* 297.)

Stier, commenting on the Temptation in his "Words of the Lord Jesus," vol. i., p. 44, says: "In manifest bodily appearance Satan cannot indeed appear, for such corporeity in him, if it may be so called, would be for us the most frightful horror. Therefore does he disguise and mask himself now as he had from the beginning, yet still comes as a person."

It is worthy of notice that one class of writers and thinkers attributes the belief in a personal Satan to Jewish sources, regards it, in fact, as an accommodation to Jewish modes of thought; while Matthew Arnold, in "Literature and Dogma," gravely tells us that the "Power not ourselves that makes for righteousness" was not regarded as a Personal Power by the Jews: he does not consider them to have been a metaphysical people, and so God was to them "merely the stream of tendency by which things fulfil the law of their being." It is curious that they should believe at the same time in a personal devil and in an impersonal God.

The Apocryphal books, while dwelling on demons, "have no notice of Satan. The same may be observed of Josephus." . . . . "It would be a waste of time to prove that in various degrees of clearness *the personal existence* of a spirit of Evil is revealed again and again in Scripture."*

The student will find some useful information on this subject in the Appendices to the work of Edersheim already quoted. He points out that the New Testament view of Satan differs materially from that of the Rabbis, the former describing him as the enemy of God and of good; the latter as the enemy of man only. They placed the fall of Satan subsequent to the creation of Adam, in which curious opinion they seem to have been followed by so unlikely a disciple as Jonathan Edwards. We shall have more to say on this aspect of the subject when we come to the Scriptural arguments for the personality of Satan.

"The mass of the Fathers (Justin, Athenagoras, Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Sulpicius, Ambrose, Nazianzen) hold, that though Satan fell from the beginning, the angels fell before the Deluge, falling in love with the daughters of men." (Newman, "Apologia.")

In the Gospel of Nicodemus, p. ii., cap. vii., Tischdf. Ev. Apoc., p. 307, Satan is called ἀρχη του θανατου και

* Smith, "Bible Dict.," Article *Satan*.

ῥιζα της ἁμαρτιας, that is, *the incipient cause*, as Christ is called in Rev. iii. 14—ἡ ἀρχη της κτισεως του Θεου—the originating cause of creation.

"We learn from Origen that the passage in St. Jude referring to the dispute about the body of Moses, was a quotation from an Apocryphal book called 'The Assumption of Moses,' which had a considerable circulation, at one time, in the Christian Church."*

It may be said—"If wicked angels exist, it is unreasonable to suppose that God would allow them to mar His works, and thwart His plans." Why should we consider it more unreasonable for Him to allow angels to do this, than to permit men to injure each other by precept and example, and to fill the world with cruelty? which we know to be allowed. Let any man read, without prejudice, the story of the demoniac at Gadara, and deny, if he can, that our Blessed Lord believed in the actual possession by Satan of the souls and the bodies of the possessed. Was His belief founded on ignorance or on knowledge? Did He know, or did He not?

Augustine *De Civitate Dei* has a long argument on the fall of Satan, which, as might be expected, leaves the matter very much as he found it—"*Ab initio diabolus peccat;* hoc est, ex quo creatus est, justitiam recusavit, quam nisi pia Deoque subdita voluntas habere non possit. Huic sententiae quisquis acquiescit, non cum illis haereticis sapit, id est Manichaeis: et si quae aliae pestes ita sentiunt, quòd suam quandam propriam tanquam ex adverso quodam principio diabolus habeat naturam mali; qui tantâ vanitate desipiunt, ut cùm verba ista Evangelica in auctoritate nobiscum habeant, non attendant non dixisse Dominum. *A veritate alienus fuit;* sed, *in veritate non stetit:* ubi a veritate lapsum intelligi voluit: in qua utique si stetisset, ejus particeps factus, beatus cum sanctis Angelis permaneret." ["The devil sinneth from the beginning" (1 John iii. 8), *i.e.*, from the time he was created he refused righteousness, which none but a will piously subjected to God can enjoy. Whoever adopts this opinion at least disagrees with those heretics, the Munechees, and with any other pestilential sect that may suppose that the devil has derived from some adverse evil principle a nature proper to himself. These persons are so befooled by error, that, although they acknowledge with ourselves the authority of the Gospels, they do not notice that the Lord did not say, "The devil was naturally a stranger to the truth," but, "the devil abode not in the truth;" by which he meant us to understand that he had fallen from the truth, in which if he had abode, he would have become a partaker of it, and have remained in blessedness along with the holy angels." (*Cf.* Gen. ad Lit. xi. 27 *et seq.*)] All which we dismiss as vain speculation, in no way affecting this question before us—Is Satan a person? We also dismiss as trifling the objection that men are always attributing to the devil the evil impulses of their own nature. We admit it, but this does not prove that there is no devil. Similarly we dismiss the objection that Satan, not being omnipresent, could not possibly tempt men at the same time in places and circumstances widely different. That which is done by his agents is done by himself, and of the number of those agents we can form no idea. It is not a question as to the extent of his operations, but as to whether they are the work of a person or not. "Personality," says Mr. Herbert Spencer, "is a fact of which each one is conscious, a fact beyond all others the most certain." True, but since we are conscious of personality, is it not conceivable that there should be personal beings of different orders and ranks above us in the scale of creation? And since we are conscious of having fallen, is it not conceivable that they too may have fallen? If we who are compounded of matter and spirit may yield to temptation of a purely spiritual nature arising from pride, ambition, etc., why should not spiritual beings be liable to fall from such a cause? If God did not take measures to preserve man from danger of falling, why should we suppose He would create angels with no liability to sin?

Have we any reason to think, from the nature of things, that fallen angels do not exist? There is surely no more reason to deny their existence than to deny the existence of holy angels. Apart from experience it is quite as likely that angels should exist as men, nay, more likely, for they are spiritual beings, and man is a being compounded of spirit and matter. Is it more difficult, apart from experience, to conceive the existence of a chain of being from man upward to God than to conceive the existence of a chain extending from man to the occupants of a drop of water? If man has perverted his nature by the abuse of free will, there seems no reason, from the nature of things, that a higher order of beings should not have done the same.

III.

Caedmon, born towards the close of the seventh century, in his paraphrase describes how the chief of the angels "for pride sank into error" and "turned away from the love of God." Thus he addresses his legions:—

> Wherefore shall I toil?
> No need have I of master. I can work
> With my own hands great marvels, and have power
> To build a throne more worthy of a god
> Higher in heaven. Why shall I for his smile
> Serve Him and bow me thus in vassalage?
> I may be God as He. . . .
> Stand by me, strong supporters firm in strife:
> Hard mooded heroes, famous warriors
> Have chosen me for chief: one may take thought
> With such for counsel, and with such secure
> Large following: My friends in earnest, they,
> Faithful in all the shaping of their minds:
> I am their Master: and may rule this realm.

Caedmon's delineation of Satan bears some resemblance to that of Milton. In dealing with the subject, therefore, we turn naturally to "Paradise Lost." Of that sublime poem Satan is the central figure: We are not attracted to Adam in the same degree that we are to the personality of the ruined archangel. Even hell with its horrors of "darkness visible," its floors of solid fire and cataracts of lurid flames, its sights and sounds of unutterable anguish is but the background to a picture that stands out the more impressively because of those ghastly surroundings. His brow graven with the thunderbolts of God, his glory withered, his heart torn with tempestuous passions of remorse and agony, yet the Prince of Darkness defies his fate and remains unaltered and unalterable in his unbending determination. "Hell," says Channing, "yields to the spirit which it imprisons. The intensity of its fires reveals the intenser passions and more vehement will of Satan, and the ruined archangel gathers into himself the sublimity of the scene which surrounds him."

The personality of Milton's Satan stands out with

* Origen, De Prin., ii. 2; Salmon, "Introduction to the New Testament," pp. 525-6.

great clearness. He plots, contrives, acts, suffers, hates, pities, and even shows at times traces of better feelings: he is moved with remorse when he sees the sufferings of his companions and with admiration at the sight of the purity of Eve. His intellect is of transcendent might, but his knowledge is circumscribed and his power limited: he is not the devil of popular superstition; he is not the devil of the Bible; but he is real, not an abstraction.

Shelley thus describes Jupiter in "Prometheus Unbound":

> The shape is awful like the sound,
> Clothed in dark purple, star inwoven,
> A sceptre of pale gold
> To stay steps proud, o'er the slow cloud
> His veined hand doth hold;
> Cruel he looks, but calm and strong;
> Like one who does, not suffers, wrong.

Compare Bunyan's description of Apollyon. "So he went on, and Apollyon met him. Now the monster was hideous to behold: he was clothed with scales like a fish (and they are his pride), he had wings like a dragon, feet like a bear, and out of his belly came fire and smoke, and his mouth was as the mouth of a lion." Both descriptions are real, though the reality in each case expresses itself differently.

Compare Mephistopheles in *Faust:*

> I am the spirit that evermore denies,
> And rightly so—for all that doth arise
> Deserves to perish—this distinctly seeing—
> No! say I—No! to everything that tries
> To bubble into being.
> My proper element is what you name
> Sin, Dissolution—in a word, *the Bad.*
> I am part of a part which part at the first was All,
> Part of the Darkness that gave birth to Light.

Milton's Satan is cast in another mould. There is, indeed, a studied ambiguity in the poet's descriptions of the fiend's appearance—an ambiguity inseparable from the attempt to delineate that which evades delineation; but the personality is distinct, and the attributes—pride, ambition, envy, malice, and scorn of good—are pourtrayed in their effects and working with consummate skill.

"Dante's angels are good men with wings; his devils are spiteful, ugly executioners; his dead men are merely living men in strange situations." . . . "The spirits of Milton are unlike those of almost all other writers; his fiends in particular are wonderful creations. They are not metaphysical abstractions; they are not wicked men; they are not ugly beasts; they have no horns, no tails, none of the fee-faw-fum of Tasso and Klopstock. They have just enough in common with human nature to be intelligible to human beings. Their characters are like their forms marked by a certain dim resemblance to those of men, but exaggerated to gigantic dimensions and veiled in mysterious gloom. Perhaps the gods and demons of Æschylus may best bear a comparison with the angels and devils of Milton"*

Milton has in some places borrowed from Æschylus; as, for instance, the passage beginning line 94, Book I.: "Yet not for those, etc."; but Satan differs essentially from Prometheus. The former sought selfish ends the latter to benefit mankind: Satan studies revenge, and boasts his designs; Prometheus is content to suffer in patience, and let time and destiny set him right.

What a powerful description this is of the Apostate!

> He above the rest
> In shape and gesture proudly eminent,
> Stood like a tower: his form had yet not lost
> All her original brightness, nor appear'd
> Less than Archangel ruined, and the excess
> Of glory obscur'd. As when the sun new risen,
> Looks through the horizontal misty air,
> Shorn of his beams or from behind the Moon,
> In dim eclipse disastrous twilight sheds
> On half the nations, and with fear of change
> Perplexes monarchs, darkened so, yet shone
> Above them all the Archangel, but his face
> Deep sears of thunder had intrenched, and care
> Sat on his faded cheek, but under brows
> Of dauntless courage and considerate pride
> Waiting revenge. Cruel his eye, but cast
> Signs of remorse and passion to behold
> The fellows of his crime, the followers rather,
> Far other once beheld in bliss, condemn'd
> For ever now to have their lot in pain.

The following may be taken as a summary of Satan's creed, the principles of his infernal policy:

> To be weak is miserable,
> Doing or suffering—but of this be sure,
> To do aught good never will be our task,
> But ever to do ill our sole delight,
> As being the contrary to His high will
> Whom we resist. If then His providence
> Out of our evil seek to bring forth good,
> Our labour must be to pervert that end,
> And out of good still to find means of evil
> Which ofttimes may succeed. . . .

Whence did Milton derive his conception of the personality of Satan? It seems clear to me that it was the outcome of his own individuality. Not to go farther, the poet was above all others distinguished by strength of will: in the face of difficulties sufficient to daunt the most resolute of men—blindness, poverty, obloquy, loneliness, persecution—he persevered and completed that work which has placed him for ever in the forefront of the genius not only of his own age, but of all ages.

This unquenchable *will* is the chief feature of the Satan of Paradise Lost:

> What though the field be lost?
> All is not lost; the unconquerable will
> And study of revenge, immortal hate,
> And courage never to submit or yield,
> And what is else not to be overcome;
> That glory never shall his wrath or might
> Extort from me. . . .
> . . . And thou profoundest hell,
> Receive thy new possessor: one who brings
> A mind not to be changed by place or time;
> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven;
> What matter where if I be still the same,
> And what I should be: all but less than He
> Whom thunder hath made greater?

Johnson is severe in his strictures on Milton, remarking that he thought "women made only for obedience, and man only for rebellion." Certainly he seemed to think that Satan should not only be a rebel, but should glory in his punishment and exult in his endurance of misery. Milton has made Satan more or less a hero; the Bible paints him a liar, a murderer, and a slanderer. It is curious, however, and noteworthy that, while Milton believed in the eternity of future punishment and rejected annihilation of damned spirits, he describes Satan as not altogether wicked. He has gleams of a better nature, feels pity for others if not for himself, admires the purity of Eve, feels shame when he degrades himself to mix with "bestial slime," and is "damned beholding good"—such is the greatest conception of Satan ever painted by poet.

* Macaulay.

If Milton failed to represent adequately that spiritual world from which "Paradise Lost" professes to draw aside the veil, we may assume that it was because human mind cannot conceive nor human language describe agencies and operations purely spiritual.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"THE MESSENGER," for December, has two special features well worthy of mention. Firstly, a paper by R. Folkard, entitled "Israel's Dominion Across the Water," which is a practical view of the position of Canada as affected by the McKinley tariff. It is instructive and well written. The second point to which we would draw attention is a chapter (continued) entitled "Notes on Language," in which some Hebrew roots are most strikingly compared with those of the Welsh language. This analogy is introduced to prove the close connexion between the Celtic and Hebrew races.

"AWAKE." This new periodical, published by the Church Missionary Society at the low price of One Halfpenny per month, is just what is needed to awaken interest in missions amongst the working classes and others, who, perhaps, would not care to read the "Gleaner" or "Intelligencer." It is printed in good type, is well illustrated, and contains interesting and instructive papers, written in simple style. We commend it to our readers as highly suitable for distribution, and we sincerely hope it will have a large circulation, and be much appreciated by those for whom it is intended.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

SIR,—The assertions of "B.," under the above heading, in this day's PULPIT, appear to me contrary to sound sense.

He says the definitions and maxims of Mr. Fawcett are "entirely out of date and exploded." The first edition of his "Manual of Political Economy" came out in 1863, and the sixth, which I have, in 1883. In the preface to the latter, he said, he had not thought it necessary "to alter, in any material respect, the general arrangements of the book." Mr. Fawcett died only a few years ago, and, as far as I know, is considered to have held sound views. It is a pity "B." does not say which writers, in his opinion, are the lights of the age on those points.

He inquires, "How is, or how can be, labour a fund"? I reply, in the noblest sense, by producing wealth, and by being the indispensable agent in the production of wealth. It is practically and *essentially* more of a fund than money, which could purchase nothing of value, if labour had not first intervened, to produce it. Money itself is the result of labour. Without natural objects labour would be impossible, and without labour natural objects would remain barren of useful results, except in so far as the spontaneous productions of Nature may benefit man in the savage state. Consequently both are necessary.

I do not deny that "the cause of Value is Demand," or, to speak more correctly, "the needs of men." But I assert, that without labour there would be no demand, as there would be nothing produced, fitted for the needs of men. No man of sense would buy the stranded whale, unless he had the assurance that labour was procurable to extract the whalebone and the oil. There would be no royalty on coal, unless it were clearly known that it could be dug out of the earth. The declaration that "labour is the universal agent that produces wealth" commends itself to me as a self-evident proposition.

I rejoice in the belief that morals cannot be dissociated from business, without perilous financial consequences surely working their way onward. A growing perception of that inevitable sequence would transform the miseries of our social aspect into comfort. I feel convinced that the employer who strives to promote the welfare of his workmen, as Leclaire did, introduces a most important element of stability into his industrial undertaking, whatever may be its nature. He may, moreover, be regarded as a true patriot, in a far more extended, fruit-bearing sense, than one who thinks that the question of morals has no important relation to business.

J. B.

Canonbury, December 20th, 1890.

CONCLUDING VERSES OF ST. MARK.

SIR,—The conjecture of your correspondent, "C. P. M.," that the concluding leaves of St. Mark's Gospel were lost in one of the early persecutions at Rome, seems very probable, though it never can be anything more than a conjecture.

But his mention of the importance of Alexandria raises this question, which occurred to me long ago: Why is Alexandria never mentioned in connection with the work of the Apostles? Its name is found but three times in the New Testament. We are told that there was an Alexandrian synagogue at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 9); that Apollos was an Alexandrian by birth; and that St. Paul sailed in an Alexandrian ship. This is all. Yet Alexandria was as important a city as Antioch or Ephesus, and much more important than Thessalonica, Athens, or Crete, and it contained a large Jewish population.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, December 20th, 1890.

CONFIRMATION GRACE.

SIR,—Can any one be found who thinks the institution of Godparents anything now-a-days but an empty form? Can any one be found who thinks that it ever could now be made anything else but a form? With the upper classes it is the occasion for complimentary greetings and the giving of presents to a new born infant. It is much the same with the middle classes. With the lower orders, and the very poor, it is nothing but an empty form. They stand for an infant just to oblige a neighbour, too often making no answer to the questions; leaving one Godparent, perhaps, alone to

answer; sometimes showing their utter absence of intelligent knowledge by saying, "I demand, therefore," as if these words were the answer to the first question; in nine cases out of ten without the slightest intention of fulfilling the promises made; in dozens of cases without making aught but a lip-promise at all. And yet to such persons we have to address the false statement—made false by them—that "the infant hath promised by you, the sureties." In numberless cases the Godparents see no more of the children for whom they have promised: they move, perhaps, into another parish. Often, too, A stands as proxy for B, who is, perhaps, in some foreign land, and may never see the child. And further, what parent would tolerate now-a-days any interference by a Godparent in the religious instruction given, or not given, to the child? The institution has become, in fact and act, a mere form, without life, for any real good effected thereby, an utter failure. Often the duty is undertaken by a Dissenter: a person whose whole doctrinal life is in fixed opposition to the Church of England, makes solemn promises for a child's instruction in accordance with her doctrinal teaching, and is solemnly charged to do what his spiritual life is opposing every day; viz., have the child taught a catechism which he repudiates and disapproves!

2. There is a very interesting book, "Practical Socialism: Essays on Social Reform," by Rev. and Mrs. S. A. Barnett. My Rev. brother is the well-known clergyman who does so much good as Incumbent of St. Jude's, Whitechapel. No. IX. of these Essays is headed, "A People's Church." Mr. Barnett shows (clearly, I think) what need there is of Reform in our Church—a Church which was once reformed to suit new needs, but which has not been made to suit the needs of modern times. I recommend this Essay to careful study all through. But I only wish now to mention that, "The particular form of Divine worship," says the Preface to Edward VI.'s second Prayer Book, "and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being in their own nature *indifferent* and *alterable*, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable," etc., etc. And by a law of Henry VIII., "The king has authority to reform and correct all errors, heresies, and abuses," and "the Parliament now takes the place the king. The Long Parliament changed the whole constitution and Ritual of the Church. The Restoration Parliament undid that work. Throughout the 17th century the Teaching, the Ritual, and the Organisation were discussed as open questions, and the present system is the result purely of a Parliamentary decision" (Barnett).

Well, sir, what I plead is this, that the Church of England is trying by old forms, and through an old constitution to spiritualize life—that as a National Church she is out of touch with a large portion of the nation—that by the vast majority of those who are the coming rulers, viz., by the working-classes, the Church and its services are unused, or if used, are too much an empty form. And one of its ordinances which has, perhaps more than any other, become an empty form, is the ordinance of Godparents.

3. Of course, if this ordinance were abolished or altered, a corresponding change must be made as regards Confirmation. I see that during last week one of the judges expressed an ardent desire for an alteration in the language of the oath which young persons had sometimes to take in a Court of Law. He suggested a simple form of words much less liable to misapprehension—much easier to the intelligence of a young person. I should like to see some analogous change in the language used, chiefly in the Rubrics and the Baptism Services in regard to Confirmation. The extent of such change need not be discussed here. What I give forth as an opinion formed from long experience is—the hopeless impossibility, with the language used now, of preventing the misapprehension that is so prevalent.

4. Our Convocation has within the last few years, by issuing new Canons in lieu of those of 1603—Canons which have no legal force, but which represent the present mind of the Church—shown its sense of the need of *alteration* of some kind. It has completely altered Canon XXIX. (which concerned Godparents), and substituted another quite different, No. LXIV. All that I deal with now is the fact that it has recognised the need of the principle of *alteration*. My opinion, or any one's opinion, on the extent or limitation of the alteration made is wholly irrelevant at this moment.

5. Sir, the fact that the Church leaves to me, as an Incumbent, to judge of the *fitness* of a candidate, shows that she did not expect me to present all my parishioners on "arriving at years of discretion" to the Bishop for Confirmation. Of course she hoped and desired that all should be fit; but she placed judgment as to that fitness as a responsible duty on the man best qualified to judge thereof. I would that that duty were more often and more firmly discharged.

6. I have in my mind's eye at this moment an actual case of sin—a man living with another man's wife. Would it be right for me to say to these persons: "You have not been confirmed by the Bishop"; to admit them to the rite; to tell them that whilst living in sin they could expect, or would receive, any benefit therefrom. But suppose I not only neglected my duty of determining their *fitness*, but also withheld from the Bishop all knowledge of their sinful conduct, am I to believe that they would be confirmed by him; receive from him any heavenly gift or blessing; be strengthened with God's grace or Holy Spirit. I will never believe it. If I am told that, owing to my neglect, such persons would of course be without benefit, then *I* can, unknown to the Bishop, control his power or authority. If I am told that his power or authority is under such circumstances over-ruled by God, and His gifts of grace are withheld, then I reply that this is to reduce the Bishop's act to a *ministerial* one. And that is what I have maintained. And if God's grace is withheld by Him from the gross sinner, I believe it to be equally withheld from the thoughtless and godless indifferentist. And thus all objection to my view falls to the ground; for it is practically acknowledged that God's grace is given, not indiscriminately by the Bishop, but only to those who truly seek it in that ordinance; *i.e.*, that those who do not seek it, the thoughtless, the careless, the godless, are not therein or thereat confirmed with God's strength or Holy Spirit. The Bishop cannot do what God will not do.

Except the opening address and the question, which are respectively declaratory and interrogatory, the *whole* of the Confirmation Service is petitionary. There is not a single word confirmatory of any act of the Bishop. It is entirely an intercession with the Almighty to give the candidates His blessed gifts. The whole of it is practically an earnest pleading with heaven for confirmation of the candidates in manifold gifts of grace. The Bishop's act has been altogether ministerial, and its fulfilment is conditional.

7. I venture to express my conviction that there is no inherent virtue in Episcopal Confirmation—that the

office belongs to the Bishop by law and custom—derived from the earliest age of the Church—a relic of the undoubted Apostolic power of conferring extraordinary gifts, which power has long since ceased. That the Bishop has no more power, by virtue of his *primus inter pares* office, to confer the Holy Spirit than I have by virtue of my priesthood. That the retention of this duty by the Bishop alone, instead of by all Priests, may be advisable, and after the example of the Holy Apostles—but is not *essential*, not being "*ordained of God*" any more than Confirmation itself. (Article XXV.)

Let me remind you that at the Ordination of Priests the Bishop *with the Priests present* severally lay their hands upon the head of everyone that receiveth the order of Priesthood. And Wheatley—a great authority on the Book of Common Prayer—says that this *custom* "has been sometimes done at the consecration of a Bishop." He quotes authority for this statement. It appears then, that in a function higher than Confirmation or the Ordination of Deacons, the Bishop receives a customary act-in-aid of His episcopal power or authority. Surely no one will think His unaided act in Confirmation to rest on a higher power or authority than His aided act in the Ordination of Priests. The assistance of the Priests is customary in the one case—not customary in the other. And that is all. We learn nothing thereby as to the Bishop's inherent power or authority to confirm or endow with God's gifts, *i.e*, to confer the Holy Spirit. I see no reason for thinking the priestly imposition of hands, other than an authority or power co-ordinate with the Episcopal, and not one merely for consent and approbation. I infer that there is no inherent virtue in *episcopal* imposition of hands, which is not also inherent in *priestly* imposition, should the Church think fit to order its exercise.

A CLERGYMAN FOR FORTY YEARS.

December 8th.

P.S.—Mr. Lawrence is not qualified by parochial experience to form an opinion whether such and such language *is* misunderstood by many candidates. Those who, like myself have had year after year to learn by painful experience than it *is* misunderstood, are qualified. I do not dispute his qualification to understand the language of the Prayer Book.

CHURCHYARD RIGHTS AND WRONGS.

SIR,—Let me try to sound a note of warning to some of my brother priests, as well as to put on their guard parishioners whose rights are protected by law against clerical trickery, by asking you to allow me to quote and thereby emphasise the judgment given last week by the Chancellor of Carlisle in a case regarding Ulpha Churchyard. Speaking *ex cathedrâ*, in the Consistory Court of the Diocese of Carlisle, Chancellor Ferguson, with no uncertain sound, says :—

"It followed from the judgment of Lord Stowell that the putting a kerbstone or other enclosure round a grave was an encroachment on the rights of the present and future generations of parishioners, and that Court was the only authority that could make such enclosures legal. In the interests of the parish, the clergy and churchwardens should not allow such enclosures. If they were put in surreptitiously, as sometimes happened, they should be removed. Where they already existed without being authorised by a faculty, they were of no legal validity whatever, and the clergyman might bury other bodies therein. It might, indeed, be his bounden duty to do so, if the churchyard was at all crowded. The fact that a clergyman had received a fee for allowing such an enclosure gave no legal validity whatever. Rather, the clergyman who did so was getting dangerously near obtaining money on false pretences. He was taking a fee for a right he could not give. The Court was the only authority."

J. ALDER WILSON.

Crathorne Rectory, Yarm-on-Tees,
December 20th.

THE RECENT "PEACE SUNDAY."

SIR,—It has been very gratifying to the Committee of the Peace Society, that so many of the Clergy and Ministers of all denominations promised to preach sermons on behalf of Peace, on the "Peace Sunday," December 21st. Will you kindly permit us through your columns, now to invite all such gentlemen to favour our Society with an intimation of the actual observance of the day, as we desire to make a record of this, in each instance.

WM. EVANS DARBY,
Secretary of the Peace Society.

47, New Broad Street, London, E.C.

CHRISTMAS CAROL, 1890.

"The desire of all nations shall come."—Haggai 2—7.
"The desire of our soul is to Thy Name."—Isaiah xxvi.

At last is come the world's Desire,
Emmanuel of the prophets' lyre;
Pure Virgin born, the Child divine
Of heaven, and royal David's line.

Let men re-echo angels' mirth,
Goodwill and peace from heaven to earth,
Sing praise to God, the One in Trio,
And in excelsis gloria Deo.

Hail! Word-Creator of the light,
Shechinah of the world's dark night;
The glorious hope of Israel's race,
The Gentiles' Saviour full of grace.
Let men re-echo, etc., etc.

Blest day for man, Thy natal morn,
When star led kings the lowly born
At Bethlehem make haste to greet,
And treasures lay at Jesu's feet.
Let men re-echo, etc., etc.

They hail Him heir of Judah's kings,—
He, Lord of universal things
Unseen and seen, Whose Word did freight
The sea of space with world's create.
Let men re-echo, etc., etc.

Content He comes in flesh to dwell,
To conquer sin and Satan quell,
And Eden cause to bloom again
Beneath His righteous sceptre's reign.
Let men re-echo, etc., etc.

All hail to Thee our soul's Desire!
Emmanuel of the prophet's lyre;
As kings and priests to Thee we bring
The treasures of our hearts, and sing—
Let men re-echo, etc., etc.

CHARLES RICHARD PANTER

THE enthroning of Dr. Lewis Lloyd as Bishop of Bangor, in succession to Dr. Campbell, took place Dec. 19th, in Bangor Cathedral. The ceremony, which has been deferred for some months owing to the changes in the Archdeaconry of Canterbury, attracted a large attendance of the diocesan clergy and leading laity, but, owing to the inclemency of the weather, there were many absentees. The Bishop, attended by the Chancellor (Mr. F. Jeune, Q.C.), the Diocesan Registrar (Mr. R. H. Pritchard), and his chaplain, was received at the west door by the Dean and the Cathedral staff, and walked in procession up the central aisle to the choir, where, the mandate having been read, he was duly enthroned by the Suffragan Bishop of Dover (Dr. Eden). The ordinary service followed, the Lessons being read by the Archdeacons of Bangor and Merioneth. The anthem was Sullivan's "Sing, O Heavens." At night there was a Welsh service, the preacher being the Rev. E. T. Davies, vicar of Aberdovey.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Madge, Rev. F. T., M.A., Minor Canon of Winchester Cathedral ; Rector of Littleton, Hants.
Marshall, Rev. R. T., M.A., Rector of Littleton ; Precentor of Winchester Cathedral.
Martyn, Rev. Charles John, M.A., Rector of Long Melford, Suffolk, and Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty ; Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.
Monck, Rev. G. G., M.A., Curate of St. George's, Everton ; Perpetual Curate of St. Matthias's, Liverpool.
Mowbray, Rev. Edmund G. L., M.A., Rector of Durley, Hants.
Murray, Rev. Arthur Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Reigate.
Noott, Rev. Edgar F. C., M.A., Rector of Barley, Herts.
Parish, Rev. J. W., M.A., Senior Curate of the Parish Church, Sunderland ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Gateshead-on-Tyne.
Pott, Rev. Alfred Percival, M.A., late Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Wakefield ; Curate of Datchet.
Rogers, Rev. H. S., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Jude's, Preston.
Silvester, Rev. J., M.A., Senior Curate of St. George's, Bolton; Vicar of St. Mary's, Hawkshaw-lane, Tottington.
Sissmore, Rev. L. T., Rector of Trinity, Bath ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Bath and Wells.
Steward, Rev. Edward, M.A., Principal of the Training School, for Mistresses, Salisbury ; Prebendary of Warminster in Salisbury Cathedral.
Sutton, Rev. E., M.A., Vicar of Eaton Bray, Dunstable.
Talbot, Rev. Edward Stuart, D.D., Vicar of Leeds ; Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty.
Upcher, Rev. A. R., M.A., Rector of Halesworth ; Rural Dean for the Dunwich Deanery.
Whitby, Rev. Canon, M.A., late Vicar of Dewsbury ; Vicar of St. John's, Sandown, Isle of Wight.
Young, Rev. Edward Mallet, M.A., Head Master of Sherborne School ; Prebendary of Bitton in Salisbury Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Downs, Rev. John, Rector of Hannington, at Hannington, near Northampton, on the 13th inst., aged 80.
Molesworth, Rev. William Nassau, LL.D., Hon. Canon of Manchester, formerly Vicar of Spotland, Rochdale, at Lee Cottage, Rochdale, on the 19th inst., aged 74.
Ralph, Rev. Henry Francis William, late Vicar of Little Horwood, at The Sisters, Clapham-common, on the 17th inst., aged 64.
Whitestone, Rev. W. A., at Micheldever, Hants, on the 21st inst., in his 61st year.
Young, Rev. Edward, at his residence, Leny, Clifton-park, Clifton, on the 16th inst., in his 91st year.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time md vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitatey for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness' Electropathetic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible ; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229216